Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY

the widow of
George Dugan, '96

BS1515
.D35A
1894
v.1

1923

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XLII.

The Prophecies of Isaiah.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1894.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE PRESBYTERIAN NEWS CO.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH.

BY

FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.,

LEIPZIG.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION.

With an Introduction

BY

PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D., OXFORD.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1894.

[*This Translation is Copyright, by arrangement with the Author.*]

DEN

OXFORDER MEISTERN ALTTESTAMENTLICHER FORSCHUNG

T. K. CHEYNE UND S. R. DRIVER

ALS DANK FÜR BEWÄHRTE LIEB' UND TREUE

GEWIDMET.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

This fourth edition of my *Commentary on Isaiah* contains the fruit of continued labour since the appearance of the third in 1875, and, after the latter was out of print, a thorough revisal of the whole has been made in preparation for a fourth appearance.

To the commentary in the form it has hitherto presented, the objection has been made that it contained too much etymological matter and too many curious details far removed from the proper object of an exegetical work. The complaint was not without foundation, and I have taken care that it cannot be raised against the commentary in its present form, especially since, apart from this consideration, I had thought to make the greatest possible curtailment, and my taste is opposed to unnecessary repetitions. In former editions of my commentaries, however, I always leave so much that is peculiar to each, that they do not quite become antiquated by later ones.

The illustrative essays contributed by my friends Fleischer (d. Feb. 10, 1888), Wetzstein, and Von Strauss-Torney are to be found in the second and third editions; those who consider these contributions of importance may still have access to them, at least in libraries.[1] The excursus by Wetzstein on the Gable mountain-range in Batanea (Ps.

[1] These papers are those of Victor v. Strauss-Torney, "Can סינים, in Isa. xlix. 12, be the Chinese?" and of Wetzstein, in the second edition, "On Isaiah, chap. xxi.;" "On the Nabl (נֵבֶל) and kindred stringed instruments, chap. v. 12;" "On הַכְּפוּחָה, chap. v. 25;" "On בְּפֻמָּה and كرسنة, and matters of agricultural botany generally, chap. xxviii. 25;"

lxviii. 16), which was published separately in 1884 as a supplement to the fourth edition of my *Commentary on the Psalms* (1883), but which has not yet been appreciated as it deserves, was the last conjoint production which I could obtain from him.

In the correction of typographical errors appearing in this edition of my *Commentary on Isaiah,* I have been somewhat fortunate; perhaps I may venture to hope that it will be found as correct as could possibly be expected. And yet even this book, after it is finished, will sooner or later, in my eyes, shrink into a very imperfect and insignificant production; of one thing only do I think I may be confident, that the spirit by which it is animated comes from the good Spirit that guides along the everlasting way.

F. D.

Leipzig, *August* 7, 1889.

"On מְזֻרָה and רַחַת, chap. xxx. 24." There are also, in the third edition, papers, "On הֲדֶרֶ in Isa. xi. 8, and יְהוּדָה in Josh. xix. 34;" "On סֶלַע in Isa. xvi. 1, xlii. 11, and בְּצָרָה in xxxiv. 6 and lxiii. 1." The contents of these essays are much more varied than the titles lead one to expect.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

The translation of chaps. i. to iv., and from page 436 to end of this volume, is by the Rev. James Kennedy, B.D., New College, Edinburgh. The Rev. William Hastie, B.D., and the Rev. Thomas A. Bickerton, B.D. (Examiners in Theology, Edinburgh University), have translated chaps. v. to xx. and chap. xxi. to page 435 respectively.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE

By Professor S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Oxford.[1]

The death of Professor Franz Delitzsch, which took place on March 4, 1890, deprived Christian scholarship of one of its most highly gifted and influential representatives. Though known probably to the majority of English students only by his commentaries upon parts of the Old Testament, these writings represent, in fact, but a part of the literary activity of his life, and, except to those who can read between the lines, fail entirely to suggest the wide and varied practical interests to which his energies were largely dedicated. The outward story of his life may be told briefly. He was born at Leipzig, February 23, 1813; and, having graduated at the University of his native city in 1835, he became Professor at Rostock in 1846, at Erlangen in 1850, and at Leipzig in 1867, the last-named Professorship being retained by him till his death. From his early student days he devoted himself to the subject of theology, and laid the foundation of his knowledge of Hebrew literature (including especially its post-Biblical development in the Talmud and cognate writings), as well as of Semitic philology generally, under the guidance of Julius Fürst, editor of the well-known *Concordance* (1840), and H. L. Fleischer, who was destined in future years to become the acknowledged master of all European Arabic scholars. What may be termed the two leading motives of his life, the desire, viz., to make the Old Testament better known to Christians, and the New Testament to Jews, were first kindled in him by the apparent accident of his meeting in these early years two agents of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. His earliest publi-

[1] Reprinted from *The Expository Times*, June 1890.

cations, which appeared during the time that he was *Privatdocent* at Leipzig, were, however, philological or historical. The first of all was a learned and interesting work on the history of post-Biblical Jewish poetry, *Zur Geschichte Jüdischer Poesie*, 1836, followed, in 1838, by *Wissenschaft, Kunst, Judenthum, Schilderungen und Kritiken*, and *Jesurun, seu Isagoge in grammaticam et lexicographiam linguae Hebraeae*, in which, following his teacher, Fürst, he developed etymological principles which were far from sound, and which afterwards, at least in great measure, he abandoned. In 1841 he edited a volume of *Anekdota* in illustration of the history of mediaeval scholasticism among Jews and Moslems. The next work which deserves to be mentioned is of a different kind—a devotional manual bearing the title of *Das Sacrament des wahren Leibes und Blutes Jesu Christi*, which attained great popularity in the Lutheran Church, and has passed through several editions (the seventh in 1886). In 1842 there appeared a Dissertation on the life and age of Habakkuk, which was followed in 1843 by the first of his exegetical works, consisting of an elaborate philological commentary on the same prophet—part of a series of commentaries which was projected by him at this time in conjunction with his friend, C. P. Caspari, but of which the only other volume that was completed was the one on Obadiah (by Caspari). A treatise on *Die Biblischprophetische Theologie*, published in 1845, closes the list of works belonging to the years during which he was *Privatdocent* at Leipzig.

Not much of importance was published by Delitzsch during the Rostock period (1846–50); he was probably at this time engaged in preparing lectures, and also in amassing that store of materials which was to be utilized more fully in future years. The seventeen years of his Erlangen Professorship were more prolific. 1851 saw *Das Hohelied untersucht und ausgelegt;* 1852, the first edition of his *Genesis*—interesting from the fact that he already clearly recognised the composite structure of the book; 1855, his *System of Biblical Psychology*, remarkable for original but difficult thought and subtle speculations; 1857, a *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, to which Bishop Westcott, in his recent edition of the same epistle, acknowledges gratefully his obligations; 1859–60, the

first edition of a *Commentary on the Psalms;* 1861–62, a monograph, entitled, *Handschriftliche Funde* (notices of the textual criticism of the Apocalypse, and an account of the re-discovery by himself of the famous *Codex Reuchlini,*—a MS. of A.D. 1105 containing the Hebrew Text, with Targum, of the prophets,—which had been used by Erasmus, but had since been lost); 1864 and 1866, the first editions of his *Commentaries on Job* and *Isaiah* respectively (in the series edited by himself and C. F. Keil conjointly). The Erlangen period was closed by a second edition of the *Psalms* (1867—incorporated now in the series edited with Keil), and the two instructive descriptive sketches of life in the time of Christ, entitled, *Jesus and Hillel* (directed against Renan and the eminent Jewish writer Abraham Geiger), and *Artizan Life in the time of Jesus.*

The literary activity of the last period of his life, the twenty-three years passed by him in his Professorship at Leipzig, shows even greater versatility than that of his earlier years. His inaugural lecture is a study on *Physiology and Music in their relation to Grammar, especially Hebrew Grammar.* The studies on the age of Christ, just mentioned, were followed before long by others of a similar nature, viz. *A Day in Capernaum* (graphically written and learned), *Sehet welch ein Mensch!* and *José and Benjamin, a tale of Jerusalem in the time of the Herods.* In 1869 he published his *System der Christlichen Apologetik,* in 1873 and 1875 Commentaries, likewise in the series edited with Keil, on Proverbs, and on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, respectively. In 1871, 1878, and 1886 there appeared three monographs, full of minute and interesting researches, entitled, *Studies on the Origin of the Complutensian Polyglott;* in 1874, in honour of his former teacher and present colleague, Fleischer, *Jüdisch-Arabische Poesien aus Vormuhammedischer Zeit; Ein Specimen aus Fleischer's Schule als Beitrag zur Feier seines silbernen Jubiläums;* in 1885 a short Biblical study, *Der Messias als Versöhner;* in 1889 another, *Sind die Juden wirklich das auserwählte Volk?* The publication of Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels* in 1878 stirred him deeply: he was alternately pained by the boldness with which it treated sacred things and impressed by its brilliancy and the frequent cogency of its argument.

The immediate result was the series of twelve papers, called *Pentateuch-kritische Studien* in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wisscnschaft und Kirchliches Leben* for 1880. In these papers Delitzsch discusses critically certain prominent questions (such as the laws respecting the Passover, the Tabernacle, Deuteronomy, the "Law of Holiness") on which Wellhausen's conception of the history of Israel turns, and, while frequently repudiating particular points in Wellhausen's argument, recognises in his conclusions a large element of truth. Six other papers on cognate topics followed in the same periodical in 1882. About this time also two courses of his lectures were published in English from notes taken by one of his pupils—*Messianic Prophecies* and *The Old Testament History of Redemption* (1880, 1881). Meanwhile he had been busy in the preparation of new and improved editions of many of his commentaries. Thus the fourth edition of his *Genesis* appeared in 1872, the fifth, incorporating the results to which his recent critical studies had led him, under the title *Ein neuer Commentar über die Genesis*, in 1887; *Job* reached a second edition in 1876, the *Psalms* a fourth edition in 1883, *Isaiah* a fourth edition in 1889. In 1888 a number of discourses and articles were reprinted by him in a volume called *Iris; Farbenstudien und Blumenstücke;* here he gives freer scope than usual to his imagination, and treats a variety of topics half playfully, half in earnest, with inimitable ease and grace. Professor Delitzsch's last work was *Messianische Weissagungen in Geschichtlicher Folge*, the preface to which is dated only six days before his death. In this volume, which contains his lectures on Messianic prophecy in the form in which they were last delivered by him in 1887, his aim, he tells us, was to state the results of his lifelong study—"eine Spätlingsgarbe aus alter und neuer Frucht"—in a clear, compendious form, as a last bequest to those engaged in missionary work.

One department of Delitzsch's literary labours remains still to be noticed. As remarked above, it was a guiding aim of his life to make the New Testament better known to Jews. This first bore fruit in the missionary periodical called *Saat auf Hoffnung*,—"Seed in hope,"—which was edited by himself from 1863, and to which he was a frequent contributor.

In 1870 it assumed a still more practical shape in an edition of the Epistle to the Romans in Hebrew, accompanied by a most interesting introduction, containing an account and criticism of existing translations of the New Testament into Hebrew, and valuable illustrations of the thought and phraseology of the apostle from Rabbinical sources. He did not, however, rest here. A series of *Talmudische Studien*, chiefly on linguistic points connected with the New Testament, which ultimately extended to seventeen papers, had already been begun by him in the *Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* (1854–77);[1] and in 1876–88 these were followed in the same periodical by another series of papers, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, supplementary to Lightfoot and Schoettgen, on the Hebrew equivalents of various New Testament expressions. These were, no doubt, "chips" from the great work on which he was at this time busily engaged; for the desire of his heart, a new Hebrew version of the entire New Testament, was now on the point of being realized, the British and Foreign Bible Society having entrusted him with the revision of the version published by them. This revision was completed in 1877. The improvements which it contained were very numerous; nevertheless, it was capable of more; and these, due partly to himself, partly derived from the criticisms and suggestions of other scholars (which Delitzsch always generously welcomed), were incorporated by him in the editions which followed (the 9th, in 1889). It was in consequence of some suggestions tendered by him for this purpose that the present writer first made the acquaintance of Professor Delitzsch, and began a literary correspondence with him, which was continued at intervals to the period of his last illness. An interesting account of Professor Delitzsch's labours in connection with this subject has been written by himself in English in a pamphlet called *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (Leipzig 1883). In its successive editions Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament has enjoyed a very large circulation, partly among Christian scholars, on account of the exegetical interest attaching to it, and partly among Jews, for many of

[1] See the subjects and dates in *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, p. 35 f.

whom the primary documents of Christianity, set forth in their own language, have been found to possess a peculiar attractiveness. During the later years of his life, Delitzsch spent much time in the successive revisions of this work, and was unwearying in the effort to make it correspond more completely with the ideal which he had set himself.[1] At the time of his death he had nearly completed his preparations for a tenth edition, which was to include such extensive improvements as to entitle it to be termed, in a certain sense, a "new" translation.[2] The translation, even in the editions which have already appeared, shows great scholarship and accuracy, and every page evinces the care that has been bestowed upon it.

Such is the record, though even so not told quite fully,[3] of Professor Delitzsch's wonderfully busy literary life. It can afford no cause for surprise that one who knew him well, and who found him working whilst lying propped up in bed during his last illness, should have remarked that he had never known a man who made uniformly such a careful use of his time. His nature was a richly-gifted one; and he had learnt early how to apply to the best advantage the talents entrusted to his charge. And yet he was no mere student of books. He had a singularly warm and sympathetic disposition; he was in the habit of meeting his pupils informally

[1] See, most recently, his short papers in the *Expositor* for February, April, and October 1889; twelve others, written by him during his last illness, and published in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1889, Nos. 45–52, 1890, Nos. 1 and 2; and *Saat auf Hoffnung*, February 1890, pp. 71–74. The first of those in the *Expositor* is of importance as evidence of the friendly spirit in which Delitzsch and Salkinson, the author of another modern Hebrew version of the New Testament, which has sometimes been placed in rivalry with Delitzsch's, regarded personally each other's work. On the characteristics of these two Hebrew New Testaments, the writer may be permitted to refer to an article by himself in the *Expositor* for April 1886 (though it should be stated that some of the grammatical faults there pointed out in Salkinson's translation have since been corrected).

[2] See *Saat auf Hoffnung*, February 1890, pp. 67–70, 74.

[3] For some minor writings, as well as several other articles in periodicals, and his contributions to Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* (Daniel, Heiligkeit Gottes, Hiob, etc.; see the list in vol. xviii. p. 725 of the second edition), have, of necessity, been left unnoticed.

in both social and religious gatherings; and he loved to make, and succeeded in making, many friends. His personality was an impressive one, and exerted a wonderful charm upon all who came within reach of its influence. He loved England; and there are many both in this country and in America who still retain the vivid memory of kindnesses received from him in past years, while they were students at Leipzig, and who have heard with sorrow the tidings of his death. The present writer never had the privilege of meeting him personally, but he has received from him many most genial and friendly letters, besides experiencing in other ways tokens of his regard. The depth and reality of his convictions are attested by many passages of his writings. His personal religion was devout and sincere. Mission work, especially among the Jews, interested him warmly; he was much attracted by the movement among the Jews of South Russia in the direction of Christianity, headed by Joseph Rabinowitzsch, and published several *brochures* illustrating its principles and tendencies. Of his pamphlet, *Ernste Fragen an die Gebildeten jüdischer Religion*, more than 4000 copies were disposed of in three months. The anti-Semitic agitation which broke out in Germany a few years ago deeply vexed him; the injustice of the charges and insinuations brought against the Jews by a Roman Catholic writer in 1881 he exposed in a pamphlet, entitled, *Rohling's Talmudjude beleuchtet*, which was followed by other publications having a similar aim.

As a thinker and author, though he is apt to be less successful in his treatment of abstract questions, and sometimes does not sufficiently hold his imagination in check, Delitzsch is forcible, original, and suggestive. His literary style is altogether superior to what those who know it only through the medium of translations would suppose to be the case. His commentaries and critical writings are distinguished not less on account of the warm religious feeling which breathes in them than for the exact and comprehensive scholarship which they display. Thoroughness is the mark of all his works. His commentaries, from their exegetical completeness, take rank with the best that Germany has produced. He brings out of his abundantly furnished treasury things new and old. Among Christian scholars his knowledge of

Jewish literature was unsurpassed. Jewish views—though these, it is true, are often only of interest as curiosities—are noticed in his commentaries more fully than in those of any other modern scholar. In difficult and controverted passages, the interpretations adopted by different authorities, from the earliest times, are compactly stated. The successive editions of his commentaries invariably bear witness to the minute and conscientious labour bestowed upon them. It is not the least valuable of their characteristics that they incorporate, or contain references to, the latest notices or researches which have any important bearing upon the text. History, philology, criticism, travel, archaeology, are equally laid under contribution by the keen-eyed author. One never turns to any of his commentaries without finding in it the best information available at the time when it was written. His exegesis, if occasionally tinged with mysticism, is, as a rule, thoroughly sound and trustworthy, attention being paid both to the meaning and construction of individual words, and also to the connection of thought in a passage as a whole. The least satisfactory of his commentaries is that on the *Song of Songs*, the view taken by him of the poem as a whole obliging him in many cases to adopt strained interpretations of the text. Delitzsch appreciated scholarly feeling and insight in others, and acknowledges gracefully (in the Preface to the second edition of *Job*) his indebtedness to the exegetical acumen of that master of modern Hebraists, Ferdinand Hitzig. In the matter of etymologies, however, Delitzsch never entirely disowned the principles which he had imbibed from Fürst; and hence, even to the last, he sometimes advocated derivations and connections between words, which are dependent upon questionable philological theories, and cannot safely be accepted.

Critically, Delitzsch was open-minded; and with praiseworthy love of truth, when the facts were brought home to him, did not shrink from frankly admitting them, and modifying, as circumstances required, the theories by which he had previously been satisfied. As was remarked above, he had accepted from the beginning, at least in its main features, the critical analysis of Genesis; and in the earlier editions of his *Commentary on Isaiah* he had avowed that not all the arguments used by rationalists were themselves rationalistic. But

as late as 1872 he still taught that the Pentateuch, as we have it, was virtually a product of the Mosaic age. A closer study of the subject, however, which he was led to undertake by the appearance of Wellhausen's *History*, convinced him that this view was not tenable; and in the papers noticed above, written by him in 1880–1882 (the substance of which is stated in a condensed form in the Introduction to his *New Commentary on Genesis*), he embraced the critical view of the structure of the entire Hexateuch, treating Deuteronomy as being, in form, the work of a prophet of the age of Hezekiah, and allowing that the ceremonial law was not probably cast into its present shape until a later date still. While accepting these conclusions, however, he holds rightly that each of the main Pentateuchal codes embodies elements of much greater antiquity than itself, and rests ultimately upon a genuine Mosaic basis. The importance of this change of position on Delitzsch's part is twofold: it is, firstly, a significant indication of the cogency of the grounds upon which the critical view of the structure of the Old Testament rests; and, secondly, it is evidence of what some have been disposed to doubt, viz. that critical conclusions, properly limited and qualified, are perfectly consistent with a firm and sincere belief in the reality of the revelation contained in the Old Testament. In the matter of the authorship of the Psalms, though there are signs in his last edition that he no longer upheld so strenuously as before the authority of the titles, he did not make the concessions to criticism which might perhaps have been expected of him. In the case of the Book of Isaiah, the edition of 1889—which, by what was felt by both to be a high compliment, was dedicated conjointly to Professor Cheyne and the writer of this notice—is accommodated throughout to the view of the origin and structure of the book generally accepted by modern scholars.

Such is a sketch, only too inadequate and imperfect, of Franz Delitzsch's life and work. He has left a noble example of talents consecrated to the highest ends. May his devotion to learning, his keenness in the pursuit of truth, his earnestness of purpose, his warm and reverent Christian spirit, find many imitators!

S. R. DRIVER.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

PROPHETICO-PREDICTIVE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In the Canon of the Old Testament the prophetico-historical are followed by the prophetico-predictive books. Both together, under the name of נְבִיאִים, form the middle of the three divisions in the collection,—the first, in accordance with their position, being designated the "Former Prophets" (הַנְּבִיאִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים), while the second are named the "Later Prophets" (הַנְּבִיאִים הָאַחֲרוֹנִים). In the Masora this middle division is sometimes called אַשְׁלְמְתָּא, "tradition,"[1] because the Torah is regarded as the fundamental revelation of God, and post-Mosaic prophecy as tradition (קַבָּלָה, for which the Aramaic is אַשְׁלְמְתָּא, from אַשְׁלֵם, *tradere*) flowing from this original source in a continuous stream; the Former Prophets are then, under the title of אַשְׁלְמְתָּא קַדְמָיְתָא, distinguished from the Later Prophets, which are called אַשְׁלְמְתָּא תִּנְיָנָא.

It is true that the Torah also is a prophetical work, and is cited as such in Ezra ix. 11; for Moses, the mediator of the revelation of law, is, as such, the prophet to whom no other was like, Deut. xxxiv. 10; but it was not becoming that the Pentateuch, which is separated from the Book of Joshua under the name of התורה (ספר), should be included in the division of the Canon which is designated "the Prophets;" it is certainly the unique record of the fundamental revelation which has ever conditioned the existence and life of Israel as the nation pre-eminently associated with the history of re-

[1] Regarding this Masoretic title, see Johannes Delitzsch, *De Inspiratione Scripturae Sacrae*, 1872, p. 7 f.

demption, and from which, moreover, all prophecy in Israel has been derived. And this holds true, not merely of prophecy, but of all later writings. Not only the prophetic style of writing history, but also the non-prophetic,—*i.e.* the priestly, the political, the popular styles,—has its model in this Torah. The former follows the Jehovistico-Deuteronomic type, the latter the Elohistic.[1]

The opinion that the historical works found among the Hagiographa were placed there merely because of their later origin, but should properly have been ranged among the "Former Prophets,"[2] rests on a misconception concerning this variety in the style of writing history. Ezra,—whom we have good ground for regarding as the author of the great "Book

[1] With reference to the Pentateuchal criticism, we purposely remark here, in a conspicuous position, that the acknowledged Isaianic discourses present parallels to all the constituent portions of the Pentateuch. (1) The Jehovist: כליל התקדש חג, xxx. 29, cf. פסוח, xxxi. 5 ∿ Ex. xii. 13, 23, 27 (only here in Jehovistic context is the name of the festival referred to the verb פסח); מצבה . . . ליהוה, xix. 19 ∿ Gen. xxviii. 18, 22, xxxi. 13 (as, inasmuch as the law forbids the erection of a מצבה, not only as a means of heathen worship, Lev. xxvi. 1, but also absolutely, Deut. xvi. 22, the view which the prophet reveals appears to be shaped by a reference to the מצבה of Jacob at Bethel).—(2) The Law of the Two Tables: לְרָאוֹת פני יְיָ i. 12 ∿ לְרָאוֹת את־פני יְיָ, Ex. xxxiv. 24 (also Deut. xxxi. 11).—(3) Deuteronomy, i. 2 ∿ the beginning of the Song האזינו, Deut. xxxii. 1.—(4) Deuteronomy together with the Law of Holiness: i. 7, ארצכם שממה ∿ Lev. xxvi. 33, ועריכם יהיו חרבה; והיתה ארצכם שממה ∿ Lev. xxvi. 31, 33, עריכם שרפות אש; אדמתכם לנגדכם זרים אכלים אתה ∿ Deut. xxviii. 33 (cf. 51; Lev. xxvi. 16); ושממה כמהפכת זרים ∿ Deut. xxix. 22, כמהפכת סדם ועמרה (cf. the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah in ver. 10 ff.). Add also xxxvi. 7, according to which Hezekiah abolished the high places, and centralized the worship in the Temple of Jerusalem: the restriction of worship to one place, accordingly, does not date from Josiah's time.—(5) The Elohist: iv. 5, וברא יהוה ∿ Gen. i. 1 (though I would not adduce this parallel, if Wellhausen did not pronounce ברא to be the late production of theological abstraction, and the passage in Isaiah corrupt); i. 14, חדשיכם ∿ Num. x. 10, xxviii. 11; מקרא, i. 13 (which occurs with the Elohist and elsewhere also, but not with the Jehovist), and עצרת in the same verse ∿ עצרת, Num. xxix. 35 (and elsewhere also, but not with the Jehovist); קטרת in the same verse ∿ Lev. ii. 2, ix. 16, v. 12, vi. 8, והקטיר הכהן (viz. the אזכרה). And is not the altar in heaven, vi. 6, the antitype of the מזבח הקטרת in Ex. xxx. 27, etc.?

[2] This view has been maintained, *e.g.*, by B. Anger, *Geschichte der messianischen Idee* (edited by Max Krenkel, 1873), p. 9.

of Kings" to which the Chronicler (2 Chron. xxiv. 27) refers under the title מִדְרַשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים, a collection bearing on the history of Israel, to which he had appended, as the concluding portion, the history of the time of the Restoration,—is nowhere called a "prophet" (נָבִיא), and, in fact, he was not one. The Chronicler also—who, besides the Books of Samuel and of Kings, both of which have been arbitrarily divided into two parts, had also before him that work of Ezra as his main source of authority, and thence produced the historical compendium lying before us, the conclusion of which was made up of the memorabilia of Ezra (now, however, in separate form as the Book of Ezra)—makes no claim to be a prophet. Nehemiah, too, — from whose memorabilia our Book of Nehemiah is an extract, arranged in the same fashion as the Book of Ezra,—was not a prophet, but a Tirshatha, *i.e.* a provincial governor under the king of Persia. The Book of Esther, however, through its relegation of the religious element to the background, is as far as possible removed from the prophetic style of writing history; from the latter, indeed, it differs as characteristically as the Feast of Purim, the Jewish Carnival, differs from the Passover, the Israelitish Christmas. But it must seem strange that the Book of Ruth stands among the Hagiographa. This little work so closely resembles in character the closing portion of the Book of Judges (chaps. xvii.–xxi.) that it might have been placed between Judges and Samuel, and probably did actually stand there originally; only for liturgical reasons has it been placed beside the so-called five Megilloth (festival rolls), which succeed one another in accordance with the festival calendar of the ecclesiastical year; for the Book of Canticles forms the lesson read on the eighth day of the Feast of Passover, Ruth is read on the second day of the Feast of Weeks (Pentecost), Kinoth (Lamentations) on the ninth of the month Abib, Koheleth (Ecclesiastes) on the third day of the Feast of Tabernacles, while Esther is read in the Feast of Purim, which falls in the middle of Adar.

This is also the simplest answer to the question why the Lamentations of Jeremiah are not appended to the collection of Jeremiah's prophecies. The Psalms, however,—though David may be called a prophet (Acts ii. 30), and Asaph is named "the seer" (הַחֹזֶה), — stand first among the Hagio-

grapha, inasmuch as they do not belong to the literature of prophecy (נבואה), but of that of sacred lyric poetry (שיר יהוה). Their prophetic contents are entirely lyric in their origin, whereas the lyric contents of the Lamentations throughout presuppose the official position and public announcements of Jeremiah as a prophet. Among the canonical books of the prophets (נביאים) are found only the writings of those who, in virtue of special gifts and calling, were commissioned publicly—whether by word of mouth or by writing—to proclaim the word of God; and this they did freely, not being fettered, like the priests, by legal forms. For, though the name נָבִיא denotes one who announces, publishes, proclaims, *i.e.* (as we must further conceive of him) one who speaks as the organ (פה, "mouth," Ex. iv. 15 f.; Jer. xv. 19) of God; and though the earliest application of the term (see Gen. xx. 7; cf. xviii. 17–19; Ps. cv. 15), which is revived in the writings of the Chronicler, is far wider than the later; yet here, in designating the middle division of the Canon of the Old Testament, the word is certainly not so restricted as in Amos vii. 14, where it indicates one who, having gone through a school of the prophets, or at least having been educated through intercourse with prophets, had wholly devoted himself through life to prophetic teaching. It has, however, a specific sense that has been incorporated into the organism of the theocratic life: here it is the designation of one who comes forward, on the basis of a divine vocation and divine revelations, as a public teacher, and who thus professes not merely the gift of prediction, but also by preaching and writing exercises the office of a prophet,—an office which, at least on Ephraimitish soil, had further received a distinct and characteristic impress through the institution of the schools of the prophets. This explains the fact that the Book of Daniel could not find a place among the נביאים. For Daniel was not a prophet in this sense: he received and became the medium of divine revelations, but he was not a divinely commissioned public teacher like Nathan and Gad, Ezekiel and Zechariah. As remarked by Julius Africanus (in his letter to Origen concerning Susanna), not only did the way and manner in which the divine disclosures were made to him differ from the *ἐπίπνοια προφητική*, but he did not hold the office of a prophet, so that

the Talmud (*Megilla* 3*a*), speaking of the post-exile prophets in relation to him, says, "They stood above him, for they were prophets, but he was not a prophet" (אינהו עדיפי מיניה דאינהו נביאי ואיהו לא נביא).

It is thus because of a fundamental distinction between literary productions of a prophetic character properly so called, and those which are not prophetic in the same strict sense,—a distinction that holds alike in the domain of history and in that of prediction,—that all the books of historical and predictive content, which stand among the Hagiographa (כתובים, which the grandson of Sirach renders by the expressions *τὰ ἄλλα πάτρια βιβλία* and *τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων*), have been excluded from the middle division of the Old Testament Canon entitled נביאים. Distinction was made between the historical books from Joshua to Kings, and the predictive books from Isaiah to Malachi, as works of men who exercised the prophetical office, and thus as works of a prophetic character; and such books, on the other hand, as Chronicles and Daniel, which, though recognised as having been written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, were not written on the occasion of a call to make prophetic announcements through speech and writing, and did not thus originate from true prophetic inspiration. The two different styles of writing history are also really unmistakable. Each of them has its own peculiar history. The non-prophetic—considering its history and remains—we would call the national or annalistic. It is evidently quite possible that a prophetic historical work like the Books of Kings and an annalistic work like the Books of Chronicles, may have borrowed certain elements from the other historical style; but when once the distinguishing features of the two styles have been discerned, those elements which are foreign to the peculiar nature of each work, and which have merely been utilized for carrying out its design, nearly always admit of being made out with certainty.

The oldest type of non-prophetical historic composition is found in the priestly-Elohistic style of writing in the Pentateuch, as distinguished from the Jehovistic-Deuteronomic style. These two styles are continued in the Book of Joshua, and this, too, in such a way that, generally speaking, the latter appears in those portions which narrate the history of the

conquest, while the former occurs in those sections which describe the division and apportionment of the land. The Book of Judges, at the very beginning, which holds up the history of the judges as a mirror in which one may see and learn of God's dealing in salvation, bears the impress of a prophetic historical production; while the concluding portion, like the Book of Ruth, deals with Bethlehemitish stories, which point to the Davidic kingdom, the promised kingdom which formed the centre of prophecy. And though the main portion of the book is founded upon oral and even written forms of the stories regarding the judges, there are also introduced extracts from a more complete work, in which the prophetic pencil of a man like Samuel had combined into an organic whole the accounts of the judges, not merely down to the times of Samson, but even to the complete overthrow of the Philistine oppression. That the Books of Samuel are a prophetico-historical work is expressly attested by the Chronicler in a passage which refers to the main body of these books; in those pieces, however, which record the encounters with the four Philistine children of the giants, 2 Sam. xxi. 15 ff. (= 1 Chron. xx. 4 ff.), and those which tell of David's heroes (גִּבֹּרִים) who stood nearest to him, 1 Sam. xxiii. 8 ff. (= 1 Chron. xi. 11 ff.), they contain at least two remnants of national or popular historical composition, which delights in the repetition of the same words at the beginning and the end, after the manner of a refrain, and touches on the domain of an epic or national ode, reminding us, as Eisenlohr has fitly said, of the legend of Roland and Artus, and the Spanish Cid. More of such remains are found in the Chronicles, as the list of those who joined David during the time of persecution by Saul, 1 Chron. xii. 1–22, beginning with the words: "*Now these are they who came to David at Ziklag, while he was still hard pressed by Saul the son of Kish; and they belong to the heroes who are ready to help in war, armed with bows, with the right hand and the left using stones and arrows by means of the bow.*" Some of these pieces may have fallen into the hands of the later historians separately, and may have been incorporated without any change; but, so far as they are tabulated, the Chronicler leaves us in no doubt regarding their main source. After giving a census of the Levites from the age of thirty

years and upwards, in 1 Chron. xxiii. 2–24*a*, he adds in ver. 24*b* and other verses following, in a sketchy manner, that David, considering afterwards that the heavy work of former days had now ceased, reduced to twenty the age at which service should begin; for "*in the last words of David* (דִּבְרֵי דָוִד) *the descendants of Levi are numbered from the age of twenty.*" He here refers to the last part of the history of David's life in the "book of the Kings of Israel" (סֵפֶר מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) which lay before him; and we learn from 1 Chron. xxvii. 24, regarding the other work from which such lists had been transferred into this his leading source. There, after giving the list of the princes of Israel, he remarks concerning a general census that David had intended to make, "*Joab, the son of Zeruiah, began to count, but he did not finish; and there arose because of this an outburst of wrath upon Israel, and this numbering was not put into the numbering* (במספר, but read בספר, '*into the book*') *of the Chronicles* (דברי הימים) *of David.*" Hence the Annals or Chronicles of David contained such tables, which bore the character of national historic writing; and from these Annals they were transferred into the large Book of Kings lying before the Chronicler.

These official annals began with David. The kingship of Saul rose into little more than a military supremacy; and the kingdom, as reunited under him, did not develop beyond the first stages of a military constitution. Under David, however, king and people entered into a mutual relationship of the most extensive kind, and the thorough organization of the kingdom was necessarily followed by the multiplication of public servants of various kinds and degrees. We see David, as supreme head of the kingdom in all respects, even in matters of religion, acting on his official supremacy; and we meet with several entirely new offices instituted by him. Among these was the post of the מַזְכִּיר, *i.e.* "recorder," or, as the LXX. often designatively renders the word, *ὑπομνηματόγραφος*, or (as in 2 Sam. viii. 16) *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων* (Jerome, in genuine Roman fashion, "a commentariis"). The Targums similarly render עַל־דְּכָרָנָיָא מְמַנָּא, "the officer over the memorabilia" (= על ספר דכרניא, over the annals, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 8; cf. Ezra iv. 15; Esth. vi. 1). The מזכיר had to keep the national annals, and his office was different

from that of the סוֹפֵר, or chancellor. The סופר had to prepare the public documents; the מזכיר had to preserve them, and to incorporate them in the connected history of the nation. That it was David who instituted the office of national annalist in Israel is proved by the fact that references to the annals begin with the Chronicles (דברי הימים) of David, 1 Chron. xxvii. 24, and are afterwards continued in the "Book of the Chronicles of Solomon" (ספר דברי שלמה, which is an abbreviation from ספר דברי הימים לשלמה), 1 Kings xi. 41. Thereafter, references to them are carried on in Judah to the end of Jehoiakim's reign, and in Israel to the end of the reign of Pekah. Under David, and also under Solomon, the office of national annalist was filled by Jehoshaphat, the son of Ahilud. The fact that, apart from the annals of David and those of Solomon, nothing but the annals of the kings of Judah and those of the kings of Israel are ever cited, is easily and simply explained. When we view the national annals as a whole, they naturally divide themselves into four parts: the first two, the annals of David and of Solomon, set forth the history of the still united kingdom; while the last two, the annals of the kings of Judah and of Israel, presented the history of the nation as divided. The original state archives doubtless perished in the flames when Jerusalem was burnt by the Chaldeans. Copies made from these documents, however, were preserved; and the histories of the reigns of David and Solomon in the historical books which have been handed down to us, particularly rich as they are in annalistic material, show that diligence in copying and distributing was specially directed to the annals of David and of Solomon, and that these probably were circulated separately, like single decades of Livy.

Richard Simon thought the *écrivains publics* were prophets, and in more recent times also the annals have occasionally been regarded as prophetic historical compositions. I. Appeal is made to the statements of the Chronicler regarding prophetic materials in the work which formed his main source, the great Book of Kings; and it is assumed that this great Book of Kings contained the combined annals of the kings of Judah and of Israel. But (*a*) the Chronicler cites his chief source under various designations, as a Book of the Kings, once

(2 Chron. xxxiii. 8) as דִּבְרֵי (*i.e. res gestae*, or *historiæ*) of the kings of Israel, but never as the annals of the kings of Judah or Israel; he even designates it once as מִדְרַשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים, *commentarius libri regum*, and thus, as an explanation and elaboration of our canonical Book of Kings, or—what we leave undecided—of an older Book of Kings altogether. (*b*) In this Midrash there were, of course, inserted numerous and extensive pieces of a prophetico-historical character, for the purpose of illustrating the history of the kings; but the Chronicler expressly states, on several occasions, that these were incorporated materials (2 Chron. xx. 34, xxxii. 32). Among the documents which were taken into the annals, there must also have been pieces of a prophetic character, and not merely those referring to priestly and Levitical matters, military affairs, and such like; but it would be the greatest literary blunder to imagine that such pieces as the histories of Elijah and Elisha, which are plainly of Ephraimitish and prophetic origin, have been taken from the annals, especially because Joram of Israel, during whose reign Elisha flourished, is the only monarch of the northern kingdom in whose case there is no reference to the annals. The character of the documents which were chiefly utilized in the annals, and incorporated into the connected history, may be perceived from an instance found in 2 Chron. xxxv. 4, where the arrangement of the Levites into classes is referred to the "writing of David" (כְּתָב דָּוִד) and the "writing of Solomon" (מִכְתַּב שְׁלֹמֹה), which passed for royal writings, either because they were drawn up by order of the king, and confirmed by him, or because records actually written by the king's own hand formed the basis of the sections in the annals (cf. 1 Chron. xxviii. 11–19). When we further bear in mind that the accounts given by the Chronicler of the arrangements made by David regarding the priests and the Levites, point to the annals as the original source, we have—at least in 2 Chron. xxxv. 4—a confirmation of the governmental and (so to speak) royal character of these annals.

II. A second reason for regarding the annals as prophetic historical works is the consideration that otherwise, especially in the kingdom of Israel, they could not have been written in

the theocratic spirit. But (*a*) the official or state origin of the work is implied in the very fact that they end just where the work of a prophetic historiographer would properly have begun. For, of references to the annals in our Book of Kings, there are fourteen (counting from Rehoboam and Jeroboam) in the history of the kings of Judah (references being wanting only in the cases of Ahaziah, Amaziah, and Jehoahaz), and seventeen in the history of the kings of Israel (the case of Joram being the only one in which no reference is given); in neither line do the annals come down to the last monarch in the two kingdoms, but only to Jehoiakim and Pekah, from which we must infer that the writing of the national annals ceased with the approaching fall of the two kingdoms. (*b*) When we look more closely at the thirty-one references, we find that sixteen of these merely state the rest of the acts of the king mentioned are written in the annals: 1 Kings xiv. 29; 2 Kings viii. 23, xii. 20, xv. 6, 36, xvi. 19, xxi. 25, xxiii. 28, xxiv. 5; 1 Kings xv. 31, xvi. 14; 2 Kings i. 18, xv. 11, 21, 26, 31. In the case of four Israelitish kings, it is merely stated further that their גְּבוּרָה (heroism, *i.e.* their brave conduct in war) is described in the annals, 1 Kings xvi. 5, 27; 2 Kings x. 34, xiii. 8. More definite statements, however, regarding what was to be read in the annals, are found in the case of Abijam, whose war with Jeroboam was there described, 1 Kings xv. 7; in the case of Asa, xv. 23, all whose bravery, and all that he did, and all the cities that he built, being there related; in the case of Jehoshaphat, xxii. 46, where reference is made to the heroic deeds that he performed, and the kind of wars that he carried on; in the case of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. 20, where mention is made of all his heroism, and how he made the pool and the aqueduct, and brought the water into the city; in the case of Manasseh, xi. 17, all that he did, and the sin whereby he sinned; in the case of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiv. 19, what kind of wars he carried on, and how he ruled; in the case of Zimri, xvi. 20, his conspiracy that he formed; in the case of Ahab, xxii. 39, all that he did, and the ivory house that he constructed, and the cities that he built; in the case of Joash, 2 Kings xiii. 12, xiv. 15, his heroism, how he warred with Amaziah,

king of Judah; in the case of Jeroboam, 2 Kings xiv. 28, his bravery, how he warred, and how he recovered Damascus and Hamath, that belonged to Judah, for Israel; in the case of Shallum, xv. 15, his conspiracy which he formed. These references furnish plain proof that this annalistic history was not prophetico-pragmatical in its character. It recorded outward events, it had its roots in the popular mind and its sphere of action in the national life and institutions; compared with the prophetic history, it was more secular than sacred, more a history of the people than a history of redemption.

The numerous references of the Chronicler to historical writings by prophetic authors show the constant literary activity in the field of history which was displayed by the prophets generally, after the time of Samuel, with whom, properly speaking, begins the era of the prophets in Israel as a nation settled and constituted under the law (Acts iii. 24). That writer, at the close of the history of David, refers (1 Chron. xxix. 29) to the words of (דִּבְרֵי) Samuel the seer (הָרֹאֶה), of Nathan the prophet (הַנָּבִיא), and of Gad the seer (הַחֹזֶה); at the end of the history of Solomon (2 Chron. ix. 29) to the words of (דִּבְרֵי) the prophecy of (נְבוּאַת) Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of (חֲזוֹת) Jedi (or Jedo) the seer; in the case of Rehoboam (2 Chron. xii. 15), to the words of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the seer; in the case of Abijah (2 Chron. xiii. 22), to the commentary of (מִדְרַשׁ) the prophet Iddo; in the case of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 24), to the words of Jehu the son of Hanani, which were included in the Book of the Kings of Israel; in the case of Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22), to a complete history of that king, which was composed by Isaiah the son of Amoz; in the case of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxii. 32), to the vision of (חָזוֹן) Isaiah, as an account that could be found in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel; in the case of Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxiii. 19), to the words of Hozai. There is certainly room for doubting whether, in these citations, דִּבְרֵי does not rather (as, for instance, in 1 Chron. xxiii. 27) denote the historical account of such and such a person. The following reasons, however, prove that, in the mind of the Chronicler, historical accounts written by the person named were meant. (*a*) From

2 Chron. xxvi. 22 we see how easy and natural it was for him to think of prophets as historians of particular epochs in the history of the kings. (*b*) In other places also, where דִּבְרֵי is combined with the name of a prophet (as in 2 Chron. xxix. 30, xxxiii. 18), the latter is the genitive of the subject or author, not of the object. (*c*) In the citations given above, בְּדִבְרֵי is used interchangeably with עַל־דִּבְרֵי, an expression which still more decidedly requires us to understand it as referring to authorship; and (*d*) this view is put beyond all doubt by the interchange of מִדְרַשׁ עִדּוֹ, in 2 Chron. xiii. 22, with דִּבְרֵי עִדּוֹ, in 2 Chron. xii. 15. That these accounts, however, which are named after prophets, were not lying before the Chronicler as separate writings along with his main source, is evident from the fact that, except in 2 Chron. xxiii. 18 f., he never refers to both together. They had been incorporated in "the commentary of the Book of Kings" (2 Chron. xxiv. 27) lying before him, where, along with the annalistic sources of the work, they could easily be distinguished as prophetic productions. And inasmuch as it is conceivable that the author of our canonical Books of Samuel and Kings should not have made use of these sources composed by prophetic authors, it is legitimate to ask whether it be still possible for critical analysis to discover these sources, either in whole or in part,—just as one may with certainty say that the list of officers used as a boundary-stone in 2 Sam. xx. 23–26, and the survey given in 1 Kings iv. 2–19 of Solomon's ministers and his court, together with the details as to the requirements of the royal kitchen (1 Kings v. 2 ff.), the number of stalls for the king's horses (1 Kings v. 6), and similar matters, have been derived from the annals.

This is not the place to enter more minutely into such an analysis. It is enough for us, through the references given in Chronicles, to have cast light on the restless activity of the prophets, from the time of Samuel onwards, engaged in writing history,—an activity which, even without the express references, is obvious from the many historical extracts in the Book of Kings from the writings of prophet-historians. Both authors draw, directly or indirectly, from annalistic and prophetic sources. But the Book of Kings and the Chronicles themselves also, taken as a whole—when we look at their authors,

and thus at the mode in which the historical materials are arranged and wrought into shape—represent two different styles of historical composition ; for the Book of Kings is the work of a prophet, and is pervaded by the prophetic spirit, while the Book of Chronicles is the work of a priest, and bears a priestly character. The author of the Book of Kings has taken Deuteronomy and the prophetic literature as his models, whereas the Chronicler so closely imitates the old style of the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים, that his own is often undistinguishable from the style of the sources from which, directly or indirectly, his material was derived ; the work, accordingly, is a strange mixture of very ancient and very modern phraseology. From the view of history which is inserted in 2 Kings xvii. 7 f., one may see the spirit and the purpose of the author in writing the book. Like the author of the Book of Judges, who wrote in a similar spirit (see Judg. ii. 11 ff.), he seeks to show, in his history of the kings, how both the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, by despising the word of God borne to them by the prophets, and particularly through the great sin of idolatry, had fallen from one stage of inward and outward corruption to another till they reached the depth of misery in the Exile. Judah, however, with its Davidic government, was not without hope of rising again from the depths, if the hearts of the people were not closed against the prophetic preaching from their own past history. The Chronicler, on the other hand, permits his love for the monarchy and priesthood, which were chosen from the tribes of Judah and Levi, to be felt even in the annalistic surveys forming the preface to his work ; and, starting at once with the sad end of Saul, wastes not a word on the course of suffering through which David reached the throne, but hastens on to the joyful beginning of his reign, which is pictured to us in a style at once popular, military, and priestly, as in the case of the annals. Then he sets before us—almost quite apart from the history of the northern kingdom—the history of Judah and Jerusalem under the rule of the Davidic family, and this with special fulness when he is able to praise the care of the monarch for the temple and its service, and his co-operation with the Levites and the priesthood. He displays a preference and partiality for the brighter portions of the history ; whereas, in the case

of the author of the Book of Kings, the law of retribution, which prevails in the historical matter, demands at least equal prominence for the darker parts.

Both of them, nevertheless, equally afford us a deep insight into the laboratory of the two modes of writing history, and the historical works of both are rich in discourses by prophets, which deserve closer consideration, because, equally with the prophetico-historical writings from which citation is made, they are to be regarded as the preliminary and occasional exercises of the prophetic literature, properly so called, which afterwards assumed a more or less independent position, and to which the "Later Prophets" (נְבִיאִים אַחֲרֹנִים) belong. The Book of Kings contains the following utterances and discourses of prophets: (1) Abijah of Shiloh to Jeroboam, 1 Kings xi. 29–39; (2) Shemaiah to Rehoboam, xii. 22–24; (3) a man of God to the altar of Jeroboam, xiii. 1 f.; (4) Abijah to the wife of Jeroboam, xiv. 5–16; (5) Jehu the son of Hanani to Baasha, xvi. 1–4; (6) a prophet to Ahab, king of Israel, xx. 13 f., xxii. 28; (7) a pupil of the prophets to Ahab, xx. 35 ff.; (8) Elijah to Ahab, xxi. 17–26; (9) Micaiah the son of Imlah to the two kings, Ahab and Jehoshaphat, xxii. 14 ff.; (10) Elisha to Jehoram and Jehoshaphat, 2 Kings iii. 11 ff.; (11) a pupil of Elisha to Jehu, 2 Kings ix. 1–10; (12) a "burden" or message concerning the house of Ahab, ix. 25 f.; (13) Jehovah to Jehu, x. 30; (14) Jonah to Jeroboam II.,—indirectly,—xiv. 25–27; (15) a general message of the prophets, xvii. 13; (16) Isaiah's addresses to Hezekiah, chaps. xix. and xx.; (17) warning prophecy on account of Manasseh, xxi. 10–15; (18) Huldah to Josiah, xxii. 14 ff.; (19) message of warning from Jehovah concerning Judah, xxiii. 27. Of all these prophetic utterances and discourses, only Nos. 2, 9, and 18 are found again with the Chronicler (2 Chron. xi. 24, xviii., xxxiv.), partly because he relates merely the history of the kings of Judah, and partly because he aimed at supplementing our Book of Kings, which doubtless lay before him. The following prophetic utterances and addresses, not found in the Book of Kings, meet us in the Chronicles: (1) The words of Shemaiah in the war between Rehoboam and Shishak, 2 Chron. xii. 7, 8; (2) the words of Azariah the son of Obed before Asa, xv. 1–7; (3) Hanani to

Asa, xvi. 7–9 ; (4) Jahaziel the Asaphite in the assembling of the nation, xx. 14–17 ; (5) Eliezer the son of Dodavahu to Jehoshaphat, xx. 37 ; (6) the letter of Elijah to Jehoram, xxi. 12–15 ; (7) Zechariah the son of Jehoiada in the time of Joash, xxiv. 20 ; (8) a man of God to Amaziah, xxv. 7–9 ; (9) a prophet to Amaziah, xxv. 15, 16 ; (10) Oded to Pekah, xxviii. 9–11. To extend still more widely the sphere of our examination, we add (1) the address of the "messenger of Jehovah" in Bochim, Judg. ii. 1–5 ; (2) the address of a prophet to Israel, in Judg. vi. 8–10 ; (3) the address of a man of God to Eli, 1 Sam. ii. 27 ff. ; (4) Jehovah's words to Samuel concerning the house of Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 11–14 ; (5) Samuel's words to Israel before the battle at Ebenezer, 1 Sam. vii. 3 ; (6) Samuel's words to Saul in Gilgal, 1 Sam. xiii. 13 f. ; (7) Samuel to Saul after the victory over Amalek, 1 Sam. xv. ; (8) Nathan to David in view of his intention to build the Temple, 2 Sam. vii. ; (9) Nathan to David after his adultery, 2 Sam. xii. ; (10) Gad to David after the numbering of the people, 2 Sam. xxiv.

After taking a general survey of these utterances and addresses, and comparing one with another, we are warranted in assuming that some have been preserved to us in their original form, such as (in the First Book of Samuel) the addresses of the man of God to Eli, and the words of Samuel to Saul after the victory over Amalek: this we infer from their peculiar character, their sublimity, and the difference between their style and that of the historian who gives them, as this is seen elsewhere in his writings. In other cases, at least the essential features have been preserved, as in the addresses of Nathan to David: this is proved by their echoes which reverberate in later history. Among the addresses handed down *verbatim* by the author of the Book of Kings may be reckoned those of Isaiah (2 Kings xix. 6 ff., 20 f., xx. 1, 5 f., 17 f.) ; the "burden" (מַשָּׂא) in 2 Kings ix. 25 f., of primitive and peculiar form, together with some other brief utterances of prophets. Possibly also the words of Huldah are given in all essential respects, for it is only in her mouth (2 Kings xxii. 19 ; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 27), in the mouth of Isaiah (2 Kings xxii. 19), and in the "burden" to which reference has just been made, that we find the prophetic

expression "declareth Jehovah" (נְאֻם יְהוָה), which likewise meets us in 1 Sam. ii. 30 with other tokens of its being original, and whose high antiquity is fully attested by the Davidic Psalms and 2 Sam. xxiii. 1 (cf. Gen. xxii. 16). In some of these utterances the historian does not at all concern himself about giving the original words; they are prophet-voices which sounded forth at one time or another, and whose leading tone he seeks to give, as in Judg. vi. 8–10; 2 Kings xvii. 13, xxi. 10–15. Reproductions of prophetic testimonies in such general form naturally bear the impress of the reproducing writer; thus, in the Books of Judges and Kings there is visible the Deuteronomic style of thought of their final editor. But we will go farther, and must affirm generally that the predictions in the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles bear marked traces of the narrator's own hand, and of the influence exercised by indirect sources. The discourses which are common to the Chronicles and the Book of Kings, are almost literally the same in both; the remainder, however, have quite a different look. The addresses in the Book of Kings almost always begin with, "Thus saith Jehovah" (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה), or, "Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel" (so also in Judg. vi. 8, and in 2 Kings xix. 20 before the addresses of Isaiah); and there is nothing that occurs in them more frequently than the phrase יַעַן אֲשֶׁר ("because that"), and Deuteronomic expressions like הִכְעִיס, הֶחֱטִיא, נָתַן בְּיַד, and others; to which may be added a liking for similes, introduced by כַּאֲשֶׁר ("as"), 1 Kings xiv. 10, 15; 2 Kings xxi. 13. The idea of God's "choice" of Jerusalem recurs in the same words in 1 Kings xi. 36; 2 Kings xxiii. 27; and the idea "that there may always remain a light to David" (נִיר לְדָוִד), 1 Kings xi. 36, is an exclusive peculiarity of the author among Old Testament writers. The words, "I have raised thee up from among the people, and set thee for a prince over my people Israel," occur not merely in the second address of Ahijah (1 Kings xiv. 17), but also slightly altered in the address of Jehu (xvi. 2). The words, "Him that dieth in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dieth in the field shall the fowls of the air eat," are found in substantially the same form in the second address of Ahijah (xiv. 11), in Jehu's address (xvi. 4), and in that of Elijah to

Ahab (xxi. 24). The threatenings, "I will destroy every man child, him that is shut up and him that is left at large in Israel, and will sweep behind the house of Jeroboam," is found, with slight variation, in the second address of Ahijah (xiv. 10), in the address of Elijah to Ahab (xxi. 21), and in the second address of Elijah to Jehu (2 Kings ix. 8); while it is clearly seen from 1 Kings xvi. 11 and 2 Kings xiv. 26, that the form of these threatenings is the style of the narrator. It is therefore undeniable that almost all these prophet-utterances, so far as a common impress is possible at all, are of similar type, and that the common bond which unites them is no other than the subjectivity of the Deuteronomic narrator. A similar conclusion must be drawn regarding the prophetic addresses in the Chronicles, which likewise so extensively bear the unmistakable traces of the Chronicler's own treatment, that Caspari, in his treatise on the Syro-Ephraimitish war (p. 53 ff.), acknowledges, even regarding what seems to be the most original of all the addresses (in 2 Chron. xv. 2–7), that it recalls the peculiar style of the Chronicler. In the case of the Chronicler, however, whose chief source of material must have resembled the spirit and style of his own,—an assumption which the Book of Ezra especially warrants us in making,—it is less easy to say how far he exercised a free hand than it is in the case of the author of the Book of Kings, who seems to have found the most of the addresses merely indicated in outline, and to have freely reproduced them from such sketches.

If these discourses had come down to us in their original form, we should possess in them an exceedingly important source of information for the history of the development of prophetic ideas and forms of expression. We should then know that Isaiah's favourite phrase, "for Jehovah hath spoken it" (כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר), so far as we have information, was first employed by Ahijah (1 Kings xiv. 11); that Joel, when he prophesied "in Jerusalem shall be deliverance" (Joel iii. 5), had been preceded by Shemaiah (2 Chron. xii. 7); that Hosea, in iii. 4 (cf. v. 15), took up again the utterance of Azariah the son of Oded, "And many days shall Israel continue without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law; but when they turn in their distress" . . .

(2 Chron. xv. 3 f., where, as the parallel proves, the perfects in ver. 4 are to be understood in accordance with the prophetic context); that in Jer. xxxi. 16 we have an echo of an utterance by the same Zechariah, in the words, "for there *is* a reward to thy work;" that Hanani, in saying, "The eyes of Jehovah run to and fro throughout the whole earth" (2 Chron. xvi. 9), is the precursor of Zechariah (iv. 10); and there are other similar instances. But, considering the influence which the idiosyncrasies of the two historians exercised upon the discourses which they communicate (cf. for instance, 2 Chron. xv. 2 with 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 2 Chron. xii. 5 with xxiv. 20; also ver. 7 with 2 Chron. xxxiv. 21, and the parallel in 2 Kings xxii. 13; and 2 Chron. xv. 5, "In those times," with Dan. xi. 14); considering also the difficulty in finding out the original elements of these addresses (possibly, for instance, the idea that a light will remain to David, 1 Kings xv. 4, 2 Kings viii. 19, was really first expressed by Ahijah, 1 Kings xi. 36), one will be able to make of them for this purpose only a cautious and sparing use. It is doubtful whether such expressions as, "to put my name there," 1 Kings xi. 36, and "he shall root out Israel from this good land," 1 Kings xiv. 15, have received the Deuteronomic form (see Deut. xii. 5, 21, xiv. 24, xxix. 27) from the prophet or from the author of the Book of Kings (cf. 1 Kings ix. 3 and the parallel passages in 2 Chron. vii. 20, ix. 7; 2 Kings xxi. 7 f.). There remains, however, in the predictions of those older prophets, a sufficient amount of original matter for enabling us to see in them the prefigurations and predecessors of the later ones. Thus Shemaiah, with his threat against Rehoboam and its later modification (2 Chron. xii. 5–8), reminds us of Micah opposing Hezekiah (Jer. xxvi. 17 ff.). The position assumed by Hanani towards Asa, when he invoked the aid of Syria, is precisely the same as that of Isaiah in relation to Ahaz,—as there is also a close resemblance generally between both events. Like the man of God in Bethel, Hosea and Amos prophesied against the "high places of Aven" (Hos. x. 8), and the "altars of Bethel" (Amos iii. 14, ix. 1). When Amos, in consequence of the divine call (Amos vii. 15), leaves his home and betakes himself to Bethel, the chief seat of the Israelitish image-worship,

in order to prophesy against the idolatrous kingdom, is there not in this a repetition of the history of the prophet in 1 Kings xiii.? And when Hanani, in consequence of denouncing Asa, is thrown into prison, is this not a kind of prelude to the subsequent fate of Micaiah the son of Imlah (1 Kings xxii.), and of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxii.)? Moreover, Ahijah's symbolization and confirmation of what he predicted, by rending into twelve pieces a new garment (a symbol of the kingdom still undivided and strong), has its analogies in the history of the earlier prophets (1 Sam. xv. 26–29) as in that of the later (Jer. xxii.). It is only such signs (מוֹפְתִים) as that by which the prophet who came from Judah to Bethel confirmed his prophecy (1 Kings xiii. 3), that almost wholly disappear from the later history of the prophets, though even Isaiah does not disdain to offer King Ahaz a sign in verification of his prophetic testimony (Isa. vii. 11).

No essential difference exists between the prophecy of earlier and that of later times; in particular, we see it is the same spirit which from the first, and all through, unites the prophets of both kingdoms, notwithstanding the diversity of action which was necessitated by different circumstances. But differences do present themselves. The earlier prophets are exclusively occupied with the internal affairs of the kingdom, and do not as yet draw within their range the history of other nations in the world with which that of Israel was closely interwoven; their predictions are exclusively directed to the king and people of both kingdoms, and not yet to a foreign nation,—one of the neighbouring peoples, or what we might expect, the Egyptians and Syrians; the Messianic element still lies in a non-transparent chrysalis state; and the poetry of thought and language, which afterwards appeared as the result of prophetic inspiration, announces itself only in some striking figures of speech. As we have seen, it is perhaps scarcely possible to pronounce a decided opinion regarding the style of delivery of these older prophets; but, from a general impression of a sufficiently reliable kind, we may distinguish prophecy, down till about the time of King Joash, as the prophecy of overmastering action, from the later prophecy, which was that of convincing speech: as remarked by G. Baur, in the case of the older prophets it is

only as a confirmation of clear inward conviction that concern is shown about words,—the modest attendants of powerful external action. Just for this reason they could not very well produce prophetic writings in the highest sense of the word. But even from the time of Samuel, the prophets as a body had made it a part of the duties of their calling to treat the history of their time in a theocratic-pragmatic way. The cloistral, but by no means quietistic, retirement of the life in the schools of the prophets was specially favourable in the northern kingdom to this literary occupation, and secured for it unquestioned liberty. From 2 Chron. xx. 34, however, we perceive that prophets in Judah likewise occupied themselves with the writing of history; for the prophet Jehu belonged to Judah, and, as may be inferred from 2 Chron. xix. 1–3, lived in Jerusalem.

The literature of predictive writings, however, properly so called, had begun in the time of Jehoram king of Judah with the "vision" (חָזוֹן) of OBADIAH,—for we think we have proved elsewhere[1] that this pamphlet against Edom was occasioned by the calamity mentioned in 2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17, to which also Joel and Amos refer. Obadiah was followed by JOEL, who had before him the prophecy of the former, introducing into the wider and fuller circle of his own publication, not only matter, but also expressions, found in the prophecy of Obadiah. Here again the prophetic literature, in the higher sense, shows how it grew out of the prophetico-historical literature; for Joel informs us of the result of the penitential worship which had been brought about through his appeal, in a historical passage (ii. 18, 19*a*) connecting the two parts of his writings. It is now the fashion to bring him down into post-exilic times, but this is one of the worst fruits of the forced consistency of Pentateuch-criticism: nothing is more certain than that he flourished during the first half of the reign of Joash the king of Judah.[2] Obadiah and Joel were contemporaries of Elisha.

[1] In the essay, "When did Obadiah Prophesy?" *Zeitschrift für das gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1851, p. 91 ff.

[2] See my essay, "Two certain Results regarding the Prophecy of Joel," in the same journal, 1851, p. 306 ff.; cf. *Le Prophète Joel* nach E. Le Savoureux, von Ant. J. Baumgartner, Paris 1888.

Elisha himself wrote nothing; but from the schools under his guidance there proceeded, not merely prophetic deeds, but also prophetic writings; and it is significant that the writings which bear the name of JONAH, whom an ancient Haggada describes as one of the "sons of the prophets" (בני הנביאים) of the school of Elisha, do not so much belong to the prophetic literature, in the higher sense, as rather to the prophetico-historical, and, in fact, to the historical writings by prophets. An approximation to the time when Jonah was sent to Nineveh may seem from 2 Kings xiv. 25—according to which Jonah the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulun, had predicted the restoration of the kingdom of Israel to its promised extent — a prediction which was fulfilled in Jeroboam the son of Joash, the third of his house after Jehu, and which thus was issued in the beginning of the reign of Jeroboam II., if not even under Joash. The mission to Nineveh may belong to an earlier period than this prediction. A glance at the Book of AMOS, on the other hand, shows us that at the time when this prophet flourished, Assyria was about to arise again. The indication of time, "two years before the earthquake" (Amos i. 1), fixes nothing for us. But if Amos prophesied "in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel," then—assuming that, according to 2 Kings xiv. 23, Jeroboam II. had reigned forty-one years, from the fifteenth year of Amaziah, and was thus for fourteen years contemporary with Amaziah, and for twenty-seven years with Uzziah—his period of activity lay in the last twenty-seven years of Jeroboam's reign. When he appeared, the kingdom of Israel was still at the height of its power which had been secured through the efforts of Jeroboam, while the kingdom of Judah was yet in the low estate into which it had fallen under Amaziah; for both, he predicts a common fate to befall them at the hands of Assyria, which, though not mentioned, is nevertheless clearly meant. The beginning of the public ministry of HOSEA comes into contact, at most, with the close of the ministry of Amos. The symbolical portion (chaps. i.–iii.) with which his book begins takes us to the last five years of Jeroboam's reign, and the subsequent prophetic discourses are not out of accord with the statement in chap. i. 1 (which is

from a later hand), according to which this prophet continued to prophesy under Hezekiah, and thus till the fall of Samaria, in the sixth year of Hezekiah. After Hosea, the Ephraimitish Jeremiah, appeared ISAIAH, who according to chap. vi. was called in the last year of Uzziah, about twenty-five years after the death of Jeroboam II. His younger contemporary was MICAH, of Moresheth, who, according to chap. i. 1, did not appear till some time within the reign of Jotham, and whose book, according to the inscription "concerning Samaria and Jerusalem," must have been composed after the fall of Samaria in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign (with which also the narrative in Jer. xxvi. 17 ff. agrees), so that his ministry thus began and ended within the far longer ministry of Isaiah. The same remark holds good of NAHUM, the Elkoshite, whose "burden of Nineveh" closes the prophetic writings of the Assyrian period: he prophesied after the defeat of Sennacherib, when the power of Assyria was broken; but the yoke on Judah's neck (i. 13) was to be viewed as broken only if Assyria did not rise again. Nahum was followed by HABAKKUK, who, among the twelve minor prophets, was the last of the Isaianic type, and began to announce a new era of judgment, — the Chaldean. He prophesied before Zephaniah and Jeremiah,[1] during the reign of Josiah, and possibly even as early as Manasseh's time.

With ZEPHANIAH, then, begins the series of prophets of the type of Jeremiah, whom he resembles in following older prophets, and reproducing their materials and words in a kind of mosaic. JEREMIAH, according to the opening verse in his prophecy, was called in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign; hence he began his public ministry before Zephaniah, —for internal grounds[2] compel us to place the prophecies of the latter after the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign. Jeremiah's ministry in Judaea, and finally in Egypt, lasted more than eighty years. In his last prophetic discourse (chap. xliv.) he gives a pledge of the certain fulfilment of its threats, in the approaching fall of Pharaoh-Hophrah, who in the year 570 B.C. lost throne and life in the same place where his great-grandfather Psammetichus, a century before, had seized

[1] See my Commentary on these prophets, 1843.

[2] See my article on Zephaniah in Herzog's *Cyclopaedia*.

the Egyptian crown. Contemporaneously with Jeremiah, though without knowing him personally, so far as we are aware, EZEKIEL wrought in the same spirit among the exiles of Judah. According to chap. i. 1, 2, his call took place in the thirtieth year, *i.e.* of the era of Nabopolassar, which is nearly the fifth year after the captivity of Jehoiakim, 595 B.C. The latest date associated with his ministry (xxix. 17) is the twenty-seventh year of the captivity, which is the sixteenth after the destruction of Jerusalem,—the period between Nebuchadnezzar's raising of the siege of Tyre and his expedition against Egypt. We thus know of a ministry of twenty-two years on the part of this prophet, who, when called, may have already been older than the still very youthful Jeremiah. Jeremiah and Ezekiel are the two great prophets who spread their praying and protecting hands over Jerusalem as long as possible, and when the catastrophe was inevitable, saved it even in its fall. Their announcements, together with the prophetic sermon in Isa. chaps. xl.–lxvi., have bridged over the chasm of the exile, and laid the foundation of the restored national church of post-exilian times. This community was cheered and encouraged by HAGGAI, in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, through his prediction of the glory in store for the temple, now rising anew from its ruins, and for the house of David, which was again coming to honour in Zerubbabel. Only two months later ZECHARIAH appeared: his last predictive discourse belongs to the third year of Darius Hystaspes, the year after the promulgation of the edict requiring the building of the temple to be continued. The predictions of the second portion of his book (chaps. ix.–xiv.) are thoroughly eschatological and apocalyptic, and make use of older circumstances and utterances of prophets as emblems of the final future. Prophecy was now silent for a considerable time, until the last prophet-voice of the Old Covenant was heard in MALACHI. His book accords with the state of things found by Nehemiah on the occasion of his second stay in Jerusalem under Darius Nothus; and it was his peculiar calling in connection with the history of redemption to predict the speedy advent of the messenger appointed to precede the coming of the Lord,—namely, Elijah the prophet,—and that the forerunner would

then be followed by the Lord Himself, as "the Angel of the Covenant" (מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית), the Messenger or Mediator of a New Covenant.

This survey shows that the arrangement of the "later prophets" in the Canon is not strictly chronological. The three "greater" prophets, who are so called because of the extent of their books of prophecy, stand together; and the twelve "minor" prophets, because of the smaller extent of their books of prophecy, are conjoined in a *μονόβιβλος*, as Melito calls it, which is named שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר, in the Masora תְּרֵיסַר (=תְּרֵי עֲסַר), in the Hellenistic dialect *οἱ δώδεκα* (Wisd. xlix. 10; Josephus, *c. Apion,* i. 8; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 10), but also *τὸ δωδεκαπρόφητον* (the Book of the Twelve Prophets). Within this collection of the smaller prophetical books, chronological order is so far observed as that they fall into three groups, representing three periods of prophetic literature, viz. prophets of the Assyrian period (Hosea to Nahum), prophets of the Chaldean period (Habakkuk and Zephaniah), and prophets of the post-exilian period (Haggai to Malachi). There is, moreover, an evident desire to join, as far as possible, a prophet belonging to the kingdom of Israel with one belonging to the kingdom of Judah,—thus, Hosea with Joel, Amos with Obadiah, Jonah with Micah, Nahum with Habakkuk. Besides this, however, HOSEA stands first, not so much because the opening word in his book (viz. תְּחִלַּת, "beginning") made this an appropriate one with which to begin the collection,—still less because (as is stated in *Bathra* 14*b*) of the four prophets, Hosea and Isaiah, Amos and Micah, he was the first to be called,—but (in the same way as, among the Pauline letters, the Epistle to the Romans is placed first) because his book is the largest; and this principle of arrangement becomes more prominent in the Septuagint, in which Hosea comes first with fourteen chapters, while Amos follows with nine, then Micah with seven, Joel with three, Obadiah with one; a new series next begins with Jonah. The reason why, in the Hebrew Canon, Joel immediately follows Hosea, may lie in the contrast between the complaint of Joel over the all-parching heat and the all-devouring swarms of insects on the one hand, and the illustrations from vegetable life—bright, fresh, and fragrant—at the close of Hosea on the other. AMOS

then succeeds Joel, because, taking up again the announcement of judgment with which the latter concludes (Joel iv. 16), he opens his book with the words, "Jehovah will roar out of Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem." OBADIAH follows, on account of the mutual relation between Obad. 19 and Amos ix. 12. And JONAH comes after Obadiah, for the latter begins, "We have heard tidings from Jehovah, and a messenger is sent among the nations," and Jonah was such a messenger. Similar reasons of a more accidental character aided in the combination of a Judaic with an Israelitish prophet. The fact that Zephaniah follows Habakkuk is explained on such a ground, which happens also to accord with the chronological order; for a catchword in the prophecy of Zephaniah (i. 7), "Hold thy peace at the presence of the Lord God," is taken from Habakkuk (ii. 20). The post-exilian prophets (called in the Talmud הנביאים האחרנים, "the last prophets") then form the close, necessarily following in the order of time and in accordance with the contents of the books; for, like the transposition of Joel into the post-exilian period, the transposition of Malachi into the time before Ezra is one of the evil results of forced consistency in Pentateuchal criticism.[1]

We now return to the so-called Greater Prophets. These immediately follow the Book of Kings, which is now divided into two parts; and at the head, in the Hebrew as well as in the Alexandrian and Syriac Canon, stands ISAIAH. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel,—such is the Masoretic arrangement,[2] in accordance with the chronological order of their appearance. In the manuscripts, particularly the German and French, an-

[1] From the fact that no trace of any reference to the Priest-code is found in Malachi, but rather, on the other hand, more reference to Deuteronomy,—for to him the Levite is identical with the priest (ii. 4–7), his proscribing of mixed marriages (ii. 11) rests on Deut. vii. 3 (but cf. also Ezra ix. 14), and his requirement of the tithe and the heave-offering (iii. 8–12) is stated in Deuteronomic language in Deut. xii. 6, xi. 17,—one must draw another inference than that false conclusion of Pentateuchal criticism.

[2] In *Ochla we-ochla*, indeed, the citations from Isaiah follow those from Jeremiah and Ezekiel; but when the Masora reckons Isa. xvii. 3, חֲצִי הַנְּבִיאִים, *i.e.* the middle verse of the division called the נְבִיאִים, it is understood that Isaiah is the first prophet following after the series from Joshua to Kings.

other arrangement is occasionally found,—Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah : this is the order laid down in the Baraitha (*i.e.* the collection of treatises not taken into the official Mishna) regarding the consecution of the Biblical books and their authors, and the regulating principle here was, as shown in the Gemara,[1] affinity of contents. Jeremiah follows the Book of Kings because his prophecies almost wholly relate to the Chaldean catastrophe, with which the Book of Kings concludes ; and Isaiah follows Ezekiel, whose book ends with consolation, because the hortatory portion of Isaiah is consolation throughout.[2] In opposition to this Talmudic arrangement, —which Lagarde (*Symmicta*, p. 142) and others, following Eichhorn, erroneously regard as meant to be chronological, but which Cornill (*Jeremia und seine Zeit*, 1880) thinks was intended to express progressive estimation of the worth of the several works,—the order given in the Masora, for which better reasons can be assigned, and which is further attested by the earliest ecclesiastical writers (Melito, Origen, and Jerome), has justly maintained its superiority.

[1] The explanation is not a false one, but neither is it exhaustive. The Baraitha regards Jeremiah as the author not merely of the book containing his prophecies but also of the Book of Kings, so that "Kings" and "Jeremiah" inseparably cohere, forming the links uniting the "former prophets" with the "later prophets ;" see Marx (Dalman), *Traditio Rabbinorum veterrima de librorum V. T. ordine atque origine*, 1884, pp. 34–37.

[2] It is precisely with reference to chaps. xl.–lxvi. that Isaiah is regarded as the prophet of comfort κατ' ἐξοχήν ; so that according to *Berachoth* 57*b*, whoever sees Isaiah in a dream may look for consolation ; and according to the Midrash on the Lamentations, all the ill that Jeremiah predicted was by Isaiah turned beforehand into good.

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH,

ESPECIALLY THE FIRST PART, CHAPS. I.—XXXIX.

§ 1. *The Time of the Prophet.*

THE first requisite for an understanding and appreciation of the prophecies of Isaiah is the knowledge of his time, and of the periods during which he exercised his ministry. The *first* period embraces the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham. The starting-point is determined in accordance with the view taken of chap. vi.; but, in any case, Isaiah appeared about the end of Uzziah's reign, and thereafter laboured continuously through the sixteen years of Jotham's reign. The first twenty-seven years of the fifty-two during which Uzziah reigned run parallel with the last twenty-seven of the forty-one during which Jeroboam II. ruled. The kingdom of Israel, under Joash and his son Jeroboam II., and the kingdom of Judah, under Uzziah and his son Jotham, each passed through a season of outward splendour greater in height and duration than had ever been previously experienced. In proportion as the glory of the one kingdom faded, that of the other flourished; the bloom of the northern kingdom grew fainter as that of the south grew brighter and excelled the other. But outward splendour, in this case as in the former, carried within it the seeds of ruin and decay; for prosperity degenerated into luxury, and the worship of Jehovah stiffened into idolatry. It was during this last and longest season of prosperity in Judah that Isaiah appeared, called to the sad task

of vainly preaching repentance, and therefore also of announcing the judgment of hardening and devastation, of the ban and banishment. The *second* period of his ministry extends from the accession of Ahaz to that of Hezekiah. During these sixteen years three events occurred, all combining to bring on a new and momentous turn in the fate of Judah. In place of the worship of Jehovah, which had been conducted under Uzziah and Jotham with regularity and in external conformity to the law, open idol-worship of the most varied and abominable character commenced with the reign of Ahaz. Then were resumed and continued the hostilities already begun under Jotham's reign by Pekah the king of Israel, and Rezin the king of Damascene Syria: the Syro-Ephraimitish war threatened Jerusalem with the express purpose of destroying the Davidic kingdom. In this distress, Ahaz invoked the aid of Tiglath-Pileser the king of Assyria; he made flesh his arm, and thereby entangled the people of Jehovah with the kingdom of the world in a manner unknown before, so that they thenceforward completely lost their independence. The kingdom of the world is the Nimrodic form of the heathen state. Its characteristic feature is the constant endeavour to burst beyond its natural boundaries, not merely for purposes of self-defence or revenge, but for conquest, and to throw itself upon foreign nations like an avalanche, that it may become an ever-growing and world-embracing colossus. Assyria and Rome are the first and the last members of the world-kingdom that brought enslavement and oppression on Israel throughout her history. The times of Isaiah saw the approach of the calamity. Placed thus on the verge of this new and important change in history, and embracing the whole with his far-seeing eye, Isaiah is, so to speak, the universal prophet of Israel. The *third* period of his active ministry extends from the beginning to nearly the end of Hezekiah's reign. Under this king the nation rose almost in the same degree as it had fallen during the reign of Ahaz. He forsook the course of his idolatrous father, and restored the worship of Jehovah. The mass of the people, indeed, remained at heart unchanged, but Judah had once more an upright king who listened to the word of the prophets at his side, — two pillars of the state, men of might in prayer

(2 Chron. xxxii. 20). When it came therefore to a breaking off from the Assyrian domination, this was certainly an act of unbelief on the part of the nobles and the mass of the people, since they relied on help from Egypt,—an expectation which caused ruin to the northern kingdom in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign,—but, on the part of Hezekiah, an act of faith in Jehovah (2 Kings xviii. 7). When Sennacherib then, the son and successor of Sargon, was coming against Jerusalem, conquering the country and laying everything waste, while Egypt did not bring the help that had been promised, the carnal defiance of the magnates and the mass of the people brought its own punishment. But Jehovah averted the worst of the impending calamity; the flower of the Assyrian host was destroyed in a night, so that, as in the Syro-Ephraimitish war, now also there was no proper investment of Jerusalem; thus the faith of the king and of the better portion of the people received a reward for their quiet resting in the word of promise. There was still a power in the state that preserved it from ruin; and the coming doom, shown in chap. vi. to be inevitable, was yet once more delayed when the last annihilating blow was to have been expected. It was in this miraculous deliverance, which Isaiah predicted, and for which he prepared the way, that the public ministry of the prophet reached its culmination. Isaiah is the Amos of the kingdom of Judah; for, like the latter, he has the dreadful vocation to see and proclaim the fact that the time of forgiveness for Israel as a people and kingdom is gone for ever. But he was not likewise the Hosea of the kingdom of Judah, for the dreadful call to accompany the fatal course of his country with the knell of prophetic announcements was not assigned to Isaiah, but to Jeremiah. This is the Hosea of the southern kingdom; for to Isaiah was granted what was refused to his successor Jeremiah, once more to restrain, through the might of his prophetic power, arising from the deep and strong spirit of faith, the coming of the night, which threatened at the time of the Assyrian judgment to engulf his people. The Assyrian oppressions ceased, and, so far as Judah was concerned, were not to be renewed. The view beyond Assyria was clear, and prophecy was about to be concerned with the next world-kingdom, now cautiously

approaching. Beyond the noon-tide of his public ministry there remained the evening of life, which he cannot have idly spent, devoid of word or deed. But though he no longer took part in public affairs, he lived to the beginning of Manasseh's reign, when, according to credible tradition [1] to which allusion is made in Heb. xi. 37 ("they were sawn asunder"), he fell a sacrifice to the heathenism which had once more become predominant.

I have purposely refrained from assigning numbers which might indicate the length of reign of the four (or, including Manasseh, five) kings of Judah under whom Isaiah exercised his ministry. It is certainly difficult enough to make a thoroughly harmonious and consistent arrangement of the dates given in the Book of Kings and also in the Chronicles; but at present, after the monument literature of Babylonia and Assyria has also come forward as a witness, it is undeniably certain that the Biblical numbers assigned to the reigns of kings occasionally need correction, though in other respects they are proved to be true by indubitable Assyriological testimonies.

The founder of the received Biblical chronology was James Ussher (Usserius), in his *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, 1650–54,[2] a work at which he had laboured for sixty years. We give here a tabular view of his reckoning in that portion of the history of the kings under whom those prophets flourished who committed their prophecies to writing. The Biblical reckoning of this section rests on trustworthy tradition, but in a number of instances it is uncertain how

[1] According to the Talmudic treatise, *Jebamoth* 49*b*, it was found in a genealogical list of a Jerusalem family; and according to *Sanhedrin* 103*b* in a Targum on 2 Kings xxi. 16 (published by Assemani, *Catal. Vatic.* i. 452), it is amplified in a Jerusalem Targum which the *Codex Reuchlin* puts in the margin, lxvi. 1; and appears in simpler form (compared with the Targum) in the Apocryphal "Ascension of Isaiah" (edited in the Ethiopic text by Rich. Laurence in 1819, and by Aug. Dillmann in 1877; in Greek, from a MS. in the National Library at Paris, by O. von Gebhardt in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, xxi. 330 ff.), to which Origen appeals. Regarding a Persian form of this "Ascension," or rather the kindred "Vision of Isaiah," see Spiegel, *Literatur der Parsen*, p. 128 ff.

[2] Gustav Baur also made Ussher's system the basis of his *Tabellen über die Geschichte des israel. Volkes*, 1848, except where Prideaux (on Ezra and Nehemiah) and Bunsen (on Egypt) offered something better.

the Scripture historian himself counted the beginning and the end of the reigns, and the mutual relation of these in both kingdoms. Alongside of Ussher's calculations, accordingly, I place, by way of example, those of my friend Aug. Köhler (in the appendix to his *Biblische Geschichte des A. T.*, 1884). The figures within parentheses beside the name of the king indicate the duration of his rule, and the large numbers give the year in which the monarch in question ascended the throne.

Judah.	Ussher.	Köhler.	Israel.	Ussher.	Köhler.
	B.C.	B.C.		B.C.	B.C.
Athaliah (6), .	884	881	Jehu (28), .	884	881
Joash (40), .	878	875	Jehoahaz (17), .	856	853
Amaziah (29), .	839	836	Jehoash (16), .	839	838
Uzziah (52), .	810	807	Jeroboam II. (41),	825	822
			Zechariah ($\frac{1}{2}$), .	773	769
			Shallum ($\frac{1}{12}$), .	772	768
Jotham (16),			Menahem (10), .	772	768
Sole ruler, .	758	755	Pekahiah (2), .	761	758
Ahaz (16),	742	739	Pekah (20), .	759	756
Hezekiah (29), .	726	724	*Interregnum* .		736
Manasseh (55), .	698	695	Hoshea (9), .	730	727
Amon (2), . .	643	640	Fall of Samaria,	722	719
Josiah (31), .	641	638			

This table is merely intended to render the computation of the Books of Kings and Chronicles as objective as possible. Doubt remains especially as to the interregnum between Pekah and Hoshea; perhaps such a blank should be excluded, and the reign of Pekah made to extend to 727 B.C. No account is taken in the table of the Assyrian chronology: Köhler himself is of opinion that it helps us in several instances to the actually correct dates. He has already shown[1] that what is narrated in Isaiah, chaps. xxxviii., xxxix., occurred in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign; and, on the other hand, what we read in Isaiah, chaps. xxxvi., xxxvii., happened in his twenty-fourth year (701 B.C.).

The following durations of reigns are definitely fixed by the testimony of the Assyrian monuments:—

Shalmaneser II., ... 860–824 B.C.
Tiglath-Pileser II., ... 745–727 „

[1] In the *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1874, pp. 96–98.

Shalmaneser IV., ...	727–722	B.C.
Sargon, ...	722–705	„

The following names and dates are also given :—

Ahab (battle at Karkar between Aleppo and Hamath, against the kings of Damascus and Hamath, with their allies; unless, as Wellhausen and Kamphausen suppose, Ahab is erroneously named instead of his son, Joram), ...	854	B.C.
Jehu (tributary), ...	842	„
Azariah (*i.e.* Uzziah, in connection with Tiglath-Pileser II.), ...	740	„
Menahem (made tributary by Pul, *i.e.* Tiglath-Pileser II.[1]), ...	738	„
Pekah (dethroned by Tiglath-Pileser), .	734	„
Fall of Samaria, ...	722	„
Campaign of Sennacherib against Samaria,	701	„

See the thorough investigations of Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 2nd edition;[2] and the summaries of Friedrich Delitzsch, under the article, "Sanherib," in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.*, continued by Hauck, Band xii. (1884).

To these Assyrian synchronisms regard is shown, either entirely or in great measure, in the calculations of Wellhausen in his article on "The Chronology of the Book of Kings after the Division of the Kingdom," in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1875, pp. 607–640; cf. Kamphausen, in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, iii. (1883) pp. 193–202, and in his work, *The Chronology of the Hebrew Kings*, 1883; and of Duncker in his *History of Antiquity*, 5th edition, 1878. Following S. R. Driver in his *Isaiah, his Life and Times* (1888, p. 13), we give here the estimates of these three writers, passing over the otherwise important article in *The Church Quarterly Review* for Jan. 1886, pp. 257–271, inasmuch as the author is unknown to us, and an anonymous authority is of no weight.

[1] His name was probably Pulu (Puru) before he rose to be ruler of the Babylono-Assyrian kingdom.

[2] Translated into English by the Rev. Professor Owen C. Whitehouse, London 1885–88, 2 vols.—Tr.

Judah.	Wellh.	Kamph.	Duncк.	Israel.	Wellh.	Kamph.	Duncк.
	B.C.	B.C.	B.C.		B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
Athaliah (6), .	84?	843	843	Jehu (28), .	84?	843	843
Joash (40), .	83?	837	837	Jehoahaz (17), .	81?	815	815
Amaziah (29),	800	797	797	Jehoash (16), .	801	798	798
Uzziah (32), .	791	778	792	Jeroboam II. (41),	785	782	790
				Zechariah ($\frac{1}{2}$), .	746	741	749
				Shallum ($\frac{1}{12}$), .	745	741	749
Jotham (16), .	(750)	(751)		Menahem (10), .	744	741	748
Sole ruler, .	740	736	740	Pekahiah (2), .	wanting	738	738
Ahaz (16), .	735	735	734	Pekah (20), .	734	736	736
Hezekiah (29),	715	715	728	Hoshea (9), .	733	730	734
Manasseh (55),	686	686	697	Fall of Samaria,	722	722	722
Amon (2), .	641	641	642				
Josiah (31), .	639	639	640				

The figures do not give here the year of accession to the throne, but the complete first year of the reign of the monarch which followed his accession. Those of Duncker prefer, in seven places, instead of the Biblical figures, other numbers, which make Jeroboam II. to have come to the throne earlier than Uzziah, and Jotham earlier than Pekah,—an unfounded conjecture, as even Kamphausen thinks. A strange feature in Wellhausen's arrangement is the elimination of Pekahiah (but cf. his *Prolegomena*, p. 475). Kamphausen, in six instances, lengthens or shortens the numbers of the years indicating the duration of reigns (Amaziah, 19; Uzziah, 42; Ahaz, 20; Manasseh, 45; Menahem, 3; Pekah, 6); but, without claiming mathematical exactness for these corrections, he is rather on the whole convinced that, in the Biblical chronology of the period of the kings, we are on really historical ground. It may thus perhaps be necessary also to maintain, with W. Robertson Smith (*The Prophets in Israel*, pp. 413–419), that the year of Samaria's fall was not one of the last years of Ahaz, but one of the first of Hezekiah.

If we place the death of Uzziah in the year 740, and the defeat of Sennacherib before Jerusalem in the year 701, then Isaiah's public ministry embraced a period of forty years.

§ 2. *The Arrangement of the Collection.*

The collection of Isaiah's prophecies is, on the whole, chronologically arranged. The dates in vi. 1, vii. 1, xiv. 28, xx. 1, xxxvi. 1, are points in a continuous line. The three main divisions also form a chronological series; for chaps. i.–vi. set before us the ministry of Isaiah under Uzziah and Jotham; chaps. vii.–xxxix., his ministry under Ahaz and onwards to the last years of Hezekiah; while chaps. xl.–lxvi. —their authenticity being assumed—are in any case the latest productions of the prophet. In the middle division, likewise, the group in chaps. vii.–xii., belonging to the time of Ahaz, chronologically precedes the prophecies in chaps. xiii.–xxxix., belonging to the days of Hezekiah. In several instances, however, the chronological arrangement is set aside in favour of an arrangement according to the subject-matter. Thus the discourse in chap. i. is not the oldest, but is placed first as an introduction to all the rest; and the account of the prophet's consecration, given in chap. vi., which should stand at the beginning of the group which belongs to the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, is placed at the end, where it looks backwards and forwards, like a prediction in the process of being fulfilled. The Ahaz group, which follows in chaps. vii.–xii., is a whole moulded at one casting. But in the group belonging to Hezekiah's time (chaps. xiii.–xxxix.) the chronological order is again interrupted several times. The predictions against the nations, from xiv. 24 to chap. xxii., which belong to the Assyrian period, are introduced by a "burden" concerning Babylon, the city of the world-power (chaps. xiii.–xiv. 23), and closed by one concerning Tyre, the city of the world's commerce, which was to be destroyed by the Chaldeans (chap. xxiii.); while a shorter "burden" concerning Babylon, in chap. xxi. 1–10, divides the cycle into two halves, and a collection of prophecies regarding the nations converges in the great apocalyptic epilogue (chaps. xxiv.–xxvii.), like streams discharging themselves into a sea. Accordingly, the first portion of the Hezekiah group, of pre-eminently ethnic contents, is interwoven with Babylonian pieces which belong to divers points in the life of Isaiah. Another such piece is the great epilogue in chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., forming the last

echo of the second portion of the Hezekiah group. This second portion is mainly occupied with the fate of Judah, the judgment which the Assyrian world-power executes upon Judah, and the deliverance that awaits it (chaps. xxviii.–xxxiii.): these announcements are closed with a solemn declaration, in chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., of the judgment of God on the world of Israel's enemies on the one hand, and the redemption of Israel on the other. This Babylonian portion is followed by the historical section in chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix., which form the historical frame of Isaiah's predictions delivered near the time of the Assyrian catastrophe, and furnish us with the key for understanding not merely chaps. vii.–xxxv., but also chaps. xl.–lxvi.

If we take the Book of Isaiah, then, as a whole, in the form in which it lies before us, apart from critical analysis, it falls into two halves, chaps. i.–xxxix., and chaps. xl.–lxvi. The former subdivides into seven parts, the latter into three. The first half may be called the *Assyrian*, inasmuch as the point at which it aims and in which it terminates is the fall of Assyria; the second may be called the *Babylonian*, as its final object is the deliverance from Babylon. The first half is not purely Assyrian, however; but among the Assyrian portions are inserted Babylonian pieces, and generally such as apocalyptically break through the limited horizon of the former. The seven portions of the first half are the following: 1. *Prophecies on the growth of obduracy in the mass of the people* (chaps. ii.–vi.). 2. *The consolation of Immanuel in the Assyrian oppressions* (chaps. vii.–xii.). These two portions form a syzygy, ending with a psalm of the redeemed (chap. xii.), the last echo of the song at the Red Sea; and are separated by the consecration of the prophet (chap. vi.), which looks both backward and forward: the opening discourse (chap. i.), as a kind of prologue, forms the introduction to the whole. 3. *Prophecies of judgment and salvation of the heathen* (chaps. xiii.–xxiii.), chiefly belonging to the period of the judgment on Assyria, but enclosed and intersected by Babylonian pieces. A prophecy concerning Babylon (chap. xiii.–xiv. 23), the city of the world-power, forms its introduction; while a prophecy concerning Tyre (chap. xxiii.), the city of the world's commerce, which received its death-blow from the Chaldeans,

forms its conclusion; and a second prophecy concerning the desert by the sea, *i.e.* Babylon (chap. xxi. 1–10), forms the centre. 4. Then follows a great apocalyptic *prophecy concerning the judgment of the world and the last things* (chaps. xxiv.–xxvii.), affording a grand background to the cycle of prophecies concerning the nations, and with it forming a second syzygy. 5. A third syzygy begins with chaps. xxviii.–xxxiii.: this cycle of prophecy is historical, and treats of the revolt from Assyria and its results. 6. With it is combined a far-reaching eschatological prophecy on the *avenging and redemption of the Church* (chaps. xxxiv., xxxv.), in which we already hear, as in a prelude, the keynote of chaps. xl.–lxvi. 7. After these three syzygies we are carried back (by chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix.) in the first two historical accounts to the Assyrian period, while the other two show us, afar off, the entanglement with Babylon, which was then but about to begin. These four historical accounts, with the indications of their chronological order, are peculiarly arranged in such a way that half of them look backwards, half of them forwards; they thus also fasten together the two halves of the whole book. The prophecy in chap. xxxix. 5–7 stands between the two halves like a sign-post, bearing on its arm the inscription "Babylon" (בָּבֶל). Thither tends the further course of Israel's history; there is the prophet henceforward buried in spirit with his people; there (in chaps. xl.–lxvi.) does he proclaim to the mourners of Zion the approaching deliverance. The trilogical arrangement of this book of consolation may be regarded as proved ever since it was first observed and shown by Rückert in 1831. It falls into three sections, containing three times three addresses (chaps. xl.–xlviii., xlix.–lvii., lviii.–lxvi.), with a kind of refrain at the close.

§ 3. *The Critical Questions.*

The collection of Isaiah's prophecies is thus a united whole, whose several parts have been skilfully and significantly arranged. This arrangement is worthy of the prophet. Nevertheless, the present form of the work is not to be attributed to him, if (1) the prophecies in chaps. xiii.–xiv. 23,

xxi. 1–10, xxiii., xxiv.–xxvii., xxxiv. and xxxv. cannot have been composed by him; and (2) if the historical accounts in chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix., which we find again in 2 Kings xviii. 13 to xx. 19, are not records from Isaiah's pen. For if those prophecies be taken away, the beautiful whole, especially the book against the nations, tumbles to pieces into a confused *quodlibet;* and if chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. were not directly composed by Isaiah, then neither can the arrangement of the whole be directly the work of Isaiah; for it is precisely chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. which form the clasp binding the two halves of the collection together.

The critical treatment of Isaiah began in the following manner:—The commencement was made with the *second part.* Koppe first of all expressed doubt regarding the genuineness of chap. l.; then Döderlein expressed his decided suspicion as to the genuineness of the whole; and Justi, followed by Eichhorn, Paulus, and Bertholdt, raised the suspicion into confident assurance of spuriousness. The result thus attained could not possibly remain without reaction on the first part. Rosenmüller, who was always very dependent upon predecessors, was the first to deny the Isaian origin of the prophecy against Babylon, in chaps. xiii.–xiv. 23, though this is attested by the heading; Justi and Paulus undertook to find further reasons for the opinion. Greater advance was now made. Along with the prophecy against Babylon in chaps. xiii.–xiv. 23, the other, in chap. xxi. 1–10, was likewise condemned, and Rosenmüller could not but be astonished when Gesenius let the former fall, but left the latter standing. There still remained the prophecy against Tyre, in chap. xxiii., which, according as the announced destruction of Tyre was regarded as accomplished by the Assyrians or the Chaldeans, might either be left to Isaiah, or attributed to a later prophet unknown. Eichhorn, followed by Rosenmüller, decided that it was spurious; but Gesenius understood the Assyrians as the destroyers, and as the prediction consequently did not extend beyond the horizon of Isaiah, he defended its genuineness. Thus was the Babylonian series of prophecies set aside. The keen eyes of the critics, however, made still further discoveries. In chaps. xxiv.–xxvii., Eichhorn found plays on words that were unworthy of Isaiah, and Gesenius an allegorical

announcement of the fall of Babylon: both accordingly condemned these three chapters, and Ewald transposed them to the time of Cambyses. With chaps. xxxiv., xxxv., on account of their relation to the second part, the procedure was shorter. Rosenmüller at once pronounced them to be "a poem composed during the Babylonian exile, near its close." Such is the history of the origin of the criticism of Isaiah. Its first attempts were very juvenile. It was Gesenius, but especially Hitzig and Ewald, who first raised it to the eminence of a science.

If we take our stand on this eminence, then the Book of Isaiah is an anthology of prophetic discourses by different authors. I have never found anything inherently objectionable in the view that prophetic discourses by Isaiah and by other later prophets may have been blended and joined together in it on a definite plan. Even in that case the collection would be no play of chance, no production of arbitrary will. Those prophecies originating in post-Isaian times are, in thought and the expression of thought, more nearly akin to Isaiah than to any other prophet; they are really the homogeneous and simultaneous continuation of Isaian prophecy, the primary stream of which ramifies in them as in the branches of a river, and throughout retains its fertilizing power. These later prophets so closely resembled Isaiah in prophetic vision, that posterity might on that account well identify them with him. They belong more or less nearly to those pupils of his to whom he refers, when, in chap. viii. 16, he entreats the Lord, "Seal instruction among my disciples." We know of no other prophet belonging to the kingdom of Judah, like Isaiah, who was surrounded by a band of younger prophets, and, so to speak, formed a school. Viewed in this light, the Book of Isaiah is the work of his creative spirit and the band of followers. These later prophets are Isaian,—they are Isaiah's disciples; it is his spirit that continues to operate in them, like the spirit of Elijah in Elisha,—nay, we may say, like the spirit of Jesus in the apostles; for the words of Isaiah (viii. 18), "Behold, I and the children whom God hath given me," are employed in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 13) as typical of Jesus Christ. In view of this fact, the whole book rightly bears the name of

Isaiah, inasmuch as he is, directly and indirectly, the author of all these prophetic discourses; his name is the correct common-denominator for this collection of prophecies, which, with all their diversity, yet form a unity; and the second half particularly (chaps. xl.–lxvi.) is the work of a pupil who surpasses the master, though he owes the master everything.

Such may possibly be the case. It seems to me even probable, and almost certain, that this may be so; but indubitably certain it is not, in my opinion, and I shall die without getting over this hesitancy. For very many difficulties arise, —this first of all, that not a single one of the canonical books of prophecy has a similar phenomenon to present, excepting only the Book of Zechariah, with chaps. ix.–xiv. of which the same is said to be the case as with Isaiah, chaps. xl.–lxvi., with this difference merely, that whereas the latter are ascribed to a prophet who lived during the exile, chaps. ix.–xiv. of Zechariah are attributed to one or two earlier prophets of pre-exile times. Stade has proved the post-exilian origin of Zechariah, chaps. ix.–xiv., also; and we may still continue to assume that it is the post-exilian—but, after chaps. i.–viii., much older—Zechariah himself who, in chaps. ix.–xiv., prophesies concerning the last days in figures borrowed from the past, and purposely makes use of older prophecies. No other book of prophecy besides occasions like doubts as to its unity of authorship. Even regarding the Book of Jeremiah, Hitzig allows that, though interpolated, it contains no spurious pieces. Something exceptional, however, may have happened to the Book of Isaiah. Yet it would certainly be a strange accident if there should have been preserved a quantity of precisely such prophecies as carry with them, in so eminent a degree, so singularly, and in so matchless a manner, Isaiah's style. Strange, again, it would be that history knows nothing whatever regarding this Isaian series of prophets. And strange is it, once more, that the very names of these prophets have suffered the common fate of being forgotten, even although, in time, they all stood nearer to the collector than did the old prophet whom they had taken as their model. Tradition, indeed, is anything but infallible, yet its testimony here is powerfully corroborated by the rela-

tion of Zephaniah and Jeremiah—the two most reproductive prophets—not merely to chaps. xl.–lxvi., but also to the undisputed portions of the first half. To all appearance they had before them these prophecies, making these their model, and taking out passages for incorporation in their own prophecies, thus forming a kind of mosaic,—a fact which has been thoroughly investigated by Caspari, but which none of the modern critics as yet has carefully considered, and ventured, with like citation of proofs, to disprove. Further, though the disputed prophecies contain much that cannot be adduced from the remaining prophecies,—material which Driver, in his *Isaiah* (1888), has carefully extracted and elucidated,—yet I am not convinced that the characteristically Isaian elements do not preponderate. And, thirdly, the type of the disputed prophecies, which, if genuine, belong to the latest period of the prophet, does not stand in sharp contrast to the type of the remainder,—rather do the confessedly genuine prophecies lead us in many ways to the others; the brighter form and the richer eschatological contents of the disputed prophecies find their preludes there. And if the unity of Isaian authorship is actually given up, how many later authors, along with the great anonymous writer of chaps. xl.–lxvi., have we to distinguish? To this query no one has yet given a satisfactory reply. Such are the considerations which, in the Isaian question, assuredly do not allow me to attain the assurance of mathematical certainty. Moreover, the influence of criticism on exegesis in the Book of Isaiah amounts to nothing. If any one casts reproach on this commentary as uncritical, he will at least be unable to charge it with misinterpretation. Nowhere will it be found that the exposition does violence to the text in favour of a false apologetic design.

When John Coleridge Patteson, the missionary bishop of Melanesia, undertook his last voyage of supervision among the islands,—a voyage which ended with his martyrdom on September 29, 1871,—he was studying, on board the schooner, the Book of Isaiah, with the help of this commentary, regarding which he wrote before on one occasion, "Delitzsch helps me much in Isaiah." His last letter speaks at the close about this commentary and Biblical criticism. Miss Ch. M. Yonge, in her biography, has not given this

passage.[1] But doubtless it expressed his deep and absorbing interest in the Divine word of prophecy, which at present almost completely disappears behind the tangled thorns of an overgrown criticism. Meanwhile, if we hold ourselves warranted, on the one hand, in objecting to that direction of criticism from which a naturalistic contemplation of the world demands foregone conclusions of a negative character,—on the other hand, we are certainly far from denying to criticism as such its well-founded rights.

§ 4. *Exposition in its Present State.*

When the Church, at the time of the Reformation, began to examine and sift its possessions that had been handed down by tradition, Biblical criticism also took its rise. At the same time, Scripture exposition on historico-grammatical principles, conscious of its task, endeavoured to reach the one true meaning of Scripture, and put an end to the legerdemain of the "manifold sense of Scripture" which had been developed in accordance with tedious examples; this advance was made under the influence exerted by the revival of classical studies, and by the help of increased knowledge of Hebrew derived from Jewish teachers. For Isaiah, however, the Reformation-period itself did not accomplish much.

Calvin's Commentaries answer the expectations with which one goes to consult them; on the other hand, *Luther's* Scholia are a second-hand and poor performance. The productions of *Grotius*, important enough in other fields, are in Isaiah, as throughout the prophets generally, of little consequence; he mixes up the sacred with the profane; and being unable to follow prophecy in its flight, he clips its wings. Aug. *Varenius*, of Rostock, one of the orthodox Lutherans, wrote a Commentary on Isaiah which is not to be despised even now; but, though learned in many ways, it is the confused production of an undisciplined mind. But Campegius *Vitringa* (who died in 1722 as professor of theology at Franequer), by his Commentary in two folio volumes, which appeared in 1714, threw all the works of his predecessors into the shade. It is he who originated the historical

[1] *Life of J. C. Patteson*, vol. ii. p. 379 (cf. 268), 5th edition (1875).

method of expounding the prophets, and in this he has given us his own work as a model;[1] but, though starting with the correct principle that it does not exhaust the meaning of the prophet's words, he nevertheless, in the allegorical explanation appended to the grammatico-historical, shows that he is not yet quite free from the Cocceian method, which, without considering the complex-apotelesmatic character of prophecy, reads in the prophets the most minute allusions to the history of the world and the Church. The shady sides of the commentary usually come before the reader first; but the more he uses it, the more highly does he learn to value it. There is deep research throughout,—nowhere a superabundance of dead and dry learning. The author's heart is present in his work. At times he pauses in the path of toilsome investigation, and gives vent to his thoughts in rapturous expressions. He sees and feels more deeply than Bishop *Lowth*, who keeps to the surface, alters the Masoretic text according to his taste,[2] and does not get beyond æsthetic admiration of the form.

The era of modern exegesis begins with that destructive theology of the latter half of the eighteenth century which pulled down but could not build. This destruction, however, was not unproductive of good: the denial of the divine and eternal in Scripture has helped us to recognise its human and temporal aspects, the charm of its poetry, and—what is of still greater consequence — the concrete reality of its history. *Rosenmüller's* Scholia (3 vols.; last edition, 1811–1820) are an industrious, clear, and elegant compilation, chiefly from Vitringa; the sobriety of judgment displayed in selecting, and the dignified earnestness—far removed from all frivolity—deserve our praise. The Commentary of *Gesenius* (in three parts, or with the translation, four parts, 1820–1821), which is more decidedly rationalistic, is also more independent in its exegesis, careful in its historical expositions, and especially distinguished for its pleasing and perspicuous style and the stores of learning gathered from all the literature on Isaiah, especially the new sources of grammatico-historical knowledge opened up since Vitringa's time. The Commentary

[1] See Diestel, *Geschichte des A. T. in der christlichen Kirche*, 436–438.

[2] Against him, Köhler wrote *Vindiciae textus Heb. Esaiae*, 1786.

of *Hitzig* (1833) remains his best work, eminent for its precision, acuteness, and originality of grammatical perception, its fine tact in discovering the train of thought, its pith and exactness in stating carefully considered results; but it is also disfigured by reckless and pseudo-critical assertions of an arbitrary character, and by a designedly profane style of thought that remains unaffected by the spirit of prophecy. The Commentary of *Hendewerk* (2 vols. 1838–1843) is in philological and historical exposition often very weak; the style is diffuse, and the eye of the disciple of Herbart is too dull to distinguish between Israelitish prophecy and heathen poetry, between the politics of Isaiah and those of Demosthenes. Nevertheless, the careful diligence and earnest endeavour to point out in Isaiah the germs of eternal verities, are unmistakeable. In the work of *Ewald* (translated into English; London 1875–1881) there is universally recognised his natural penetration, and the noble enthusiasm with which he throws himself into the contents of the prophetic books, in which he finds a perpetual present; and his endeavour to attain a deep apprehension is in some degree rewarded. But it is provoking to observe the self-sufficiency with which he ignores nearly all his predecessors, the dictatorial confidence of his criticism, the false and often nebulous pathos, and the complete identification of his opinions with truth itself. In setting forth the characteristics of the prophets, he is a master; his translations, on the other hand, are stiff, and hardly according to the taste of any one. *Umbreit's* Practical Commentary (2nd edition, 1846) is useful and stimulating; a profound æsthetic and religious conviction of the glorious character of the prophetic word reveals itself in highly-poetic language, heaping one figure on another, and almost never descending to an ordinary level. The other extreme is the prose of *Knobel* (died 1863). The precision of this scholar, the third edition of whose Commentary on Isaiah (1861) was one of his last works, deserves the most grateful recognition for its excellence in philological as well as in archæological matters; but his almost affected commonness of style prevents him from seeing the depth of meaning, while his excessive desire to find historical realization everywhere conceals from him the poetry of the form. The Commentary of *Drechsler* was a real

advance in the exposition of Isaiah. It was edited by himself only as far as chap. xxvii., and then completed (2 vols. 1845–57) by me and by H. A. Hahn of Greifswald (who died in 1861), from his notes, though these afforded little that could be used in the exposition of chaps. xl.–xlvi. Since the time of Vitringa, this is comparatively the best Commentary on Isaiah, chaps. i.–xii.,[1] and especially on chaps. xiii.–xxvii. Its excellence does not lie in the exposition of details,—for this is inadequate, through the fragmentary and glossatorial style of its exegesis, and, though diligent and thorough, especially in a grammatical point of view, is not homogeneous or productive,—but in the spiritual and spirited conception of the whole, the profound perception of the character and the ideas of the prophet and of prophecy, the vigorous penetration into the inmost nature of the plan and contents of the whole. Meanwhile (1850, 2 vols.) there appeared the Commentary of Peter *Schegg*, which follows the Vulgate, and contains valuable remarks in connection with the history of translations, but also displays free and profound insight into the genesis and meaning of the prophecies; at the same time there also appeared the Commentary of Ernst *Meier*, the Tübingen orientalist, which did not get beyond the first half. If any one was specially called to advance the exegetical study of the Book of Isaiah, it was C. P. *Caspari* of Christiania: but of his Norwegian Commentary all that has appeared reaches only to the end of chap. vi.,[2] and its progress has been hindered not only by the exhaustive thoroughness of investigation at which he aimed, but also by the Grundtvig controversy, which involved him in very extensive studies in the field of Church history. Wealth of material for the following prophetic discourses is also afforded by his "Contributions to the Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, and to the history of Isaiah's time," which appeared (1848) as vol. ii. of our *Studies in Biblical*

[1] See the review by Franz Dietrich in *Reuters Repertorium*, vol. xlviii. pp. 1–25. In the same year, 1845, Schröring in Wismar began his *Studies in Isaiah*, three parts of which (1845, 1852, 1857) have appeared.

[2] *Commentar til de tolv förste Capitler of Propheten Jesaja*, Christiania 1867. Cf. also the treatise on the Seraphim in Isaiah in the Theological *Tidsskrift* for 1859, and the Essay on the position and meaning of Isaiah viii. in the History of the Kingdom of God, in the *Bibelske Afhandlinger*, 1884.

Theology; his "Programm" on the Syro-Ephraimitish war (published in 1849); and his treatise, not by any means obsolete, on "Jeremiah a witness to the genuineness of Isaiah, chap. xxxiv., and hence also to that of Isaiah, chaps. xl.–lxvi., chaps. xiii.–xiv. 23, and xxi. 1–10" (with an Excursus on the relation of Zephaniah to the disputed prophecies of Isaiah), which appeared in the *Zeitschrift f. d. ges. luth. Theologie u. Kirche,* 1843.

Among Jewish Commentaries, two must be mentioned; the work of M. L. *Malbim* (who died at Kiew 1879), which (published at Krotoschin 1849) especially deals in a concise style with the exact meaning of synonymous words and expressions; and the learned, subtle, and ever-stimulating work of Samuel David *Luzzatto,* of Padua (died 1865), part of which, from the beginning to chap. xxxviii., was published by himself under the title *Profeta Isaia volgarizzato e commentato ad uso degli Israeliti,* while the remainder was edited after his death from the materials he had left (Padua 1855–1866).

Of additional literature that has been published since the appearance of the second and third editions of this Commentary (1869, 1879), the following, arranged in chronological order, is worthy of notice:—

Cheyne, T. K. (Oriel Professor at Oxford, and Canon of Colchester): The Book of Isaiah chronologically arranged. An amended version, with historical and critical introductions and explanatory notes. London 1870.

> There had previously been published, by the same writer, Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew text of Isaiah (London 1868): frequent reference was made to this work in the second edition of our Commentary.

Seinecke, L. (Pastor at Hevensen, near Nordheim): Der Evangelist des Alten Testaments. Erklärung der Weissagung Jesaia's, Kap. xl.–lxvi. Leipzig 1870.

> See the review by Ed. Riehm, in Studien u. Kritiken, 1872, pp. 553–578.

Birks, T. R.: Commentary on the Book of Isaiah. London 1871.

ספר ישעיה, Liber Jesaiae. Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus Masorae varie illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit S. Baer. Praefatus est edendi operis adjutor Fr. Delitzsch. Leipzig 1872.

Diestel, Ludwig (died at Tübingen, 1879): Der Prophet Jesaia, erklärt von Aug. Knobel (who died 1863); Aufl. 4. Leipzig 1872.

Riehm, Ed. (died at Halle, 1888): Das erste Buch Mose nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Mart. Luthers in rediviertem Text mit Vorbemerkungen und Erläuterungen, und einem die Berichtigungen des Jesaja enthaltenden Anhang im Auftrag der zur Revision der Uebersetzung des A. T. berufenen Conferenz herausgegeben. Halle 1873.

Stade, Bernhard (Professor in Giessen): De Isaiae vaticiniis Aethiopicis diatribe. Leipzig 1873.

See the notice by Aug. Dillmann in the Liter. Centralblatt, 1874, Nr. 9.

Strachey, Sir Edward: Jewish History and Politics in the time of Sargon and Sennacherib. An inquiry into the historical meaning and purpose of the prophecies of Isaiah. Second edition, revised. London 1874.

Weber, Ferd. (died at Polsingen, 1879): Der Profet Jesaja in Bibelstunden ausgelegt. 2 vols. Nördlingen 1875–76.

Klostermann, Aug. (Professor in Kiel): Jesaja, cap. xl.–lxvi. Eine Bitte um Hülfe in grosser Noth. In Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie, 1876; pp. 1–60.

Kohut, Alex. (Chief Rabbi in Fünfkirchen): Antiparsische Aussprüche im Deuterojesajas. In Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1879, pp. 709–722.

Neteler, B.: Das Buch Isaias aus dem Urtext übersetzt und mit Berücksichtigung seiner Gliederung und der auf seinen Inhalt sich beziehenden assyr. Inschriften erklärt. Münster 1876.

See the notice by W. Baudissin in the Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1876, Nr. 19.

Reuss, Ed. (Professor in Strasburg): Les Prophètes (forming Part 2 of his work on the Scriptures), 2 vols., the former of which contains the translation and exposition of the old Isaiah portions, while the latter contains the decidedly later portions. Paris 1876.

The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters. I. Texts edited from printed books and MSS. by Ad. Neubauer. II. Translations by S. R. Driver and Ad. Neubauer. With an introduction to the translations by Prof. E. B. Pusey. Oxford and London 1876–77.

See the notice by Hermann Strack in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1877, Nr. 21.

Le Hir (formerly Professor in the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris): Les trois grands prophètes, Isaïe, Jérémie, Ezéchiel; analyses et commentaires. Paris 1877.

See the notice by W. Baudissin in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1877, Nr. 11.

Nägelsbach, C. W. Eduard (died at Gunzenhausen, 1880): Der Prophet Jesaja, theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet (Theil 14 des Lange'schen Bibelwerks). Bielefeld u. Leipzig 1877. [Translated into English, with additions, by Samuel T. Lowrie and Dunlop Moore. New York and Edinburgh 1878.]

See the notice in the Beilage zur Luth. Kirchenzeitung, Nr. 1, and that by Em. Kautsch in the Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1878, Nr. 25.

Strack, Herm. (Professor in Berlin): Zur Textkritik des Jesaias. In Zeitschrift für luth. Theologie, 1877, pp. 17–52.

Studer, G. L. (Professor in Berne): Beiträge zur Textkritik des Jesaja. In the Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie, 1877, pp. 706–730.

Fehr, Fredrik: Profeten Jesaja: Ett gammaltestamentligt Utkast. Upsala 1877.

De Lagarde, Paul (Professor in Göttingen): Semitica. Aus dem 23. Bande der Abhandl. der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissensch. in Göttingen. Göttingen 1878.

Pages 1–32 contain critical remarks on Isaiah, chaps. i.–xvii.: see the notice by Eberh. Nestle in the Theol. Literaturzeitung, 1878, Nr. 11.

Löhr, Fr. (Pastor in Zirchow a/Usedom): Zur Frage über die Echtheit von Jesaias 40–66. Drei Hefte. Berlin 1878–80.

See the notice in the Liter. Beilage der Luther. Kirchenzeitung, 1879, Nr. 17.

Köstlin, Friedrich: Jesaia und Jeremia. Ihr Leben und ihr Wirken aus ihren Schriften dargestellt. Berlin 1879.

Barth, J. (Professor in Berlin): Beiträge zur Erklärung des Jesaia. Karlsruhe 1855.

Scholz, Anton (Professor in Würzburg): Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias. Würzburg 1880.

Cheyne, T. K.: The Prophecies of Isaiah. A new translation, with commentary and appendices. 2 vols. London 1880–81. [Fifth edition, 1889.]

See my notice of the first edition in *The Academy*, 1880 (Ap. 10).

Knabenbauer, A. (Jesuit priest): Erklärung des Propheten Jesaia. Freiburg i. B. 1881.

Distinguished for the very extensive use made of the older expository literature (certainly with no great profit), and for beneficial regard to the more modern.

Guthe, Herm. (Professor in Leipzig): Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia. Leipzig 1885.

Bredenkamp, C. J. (Professor in Greifswald): Der Prophet Jesaia erklärt. Drei Lieferungen. Erlangen 1886–7.

This author has also published *Vaticinium quod de Immanuele edidit Jesaias.* Erlangen 1880.

Von Orelli, Conr. (Professor in Basle): Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia ausgelegt. Nördlingen 1887. [Translated in Clark's For. Theol. Lib., Edinburgh 1889.]

[Driver, S. R. (Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford University): Isaiah, his Life and Times. London 1888.]

[Sayce, A. H.: The Life and Times of Isaiah. London 1889.]

[Smith, George A.: The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols. London 1889–90.]

THE SUPERSCRIPTION OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

I. *The external title as handed down* is יְשַׁעְיָה. The LXX. always modifies the form of the prophet's name into *ΗΣΑΙΑΣ* (see Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 111); on the other hand, it renders the name ישעיה in Ezra viii. 7, 19 by *Ἰσαΐας* (but in other places in many other ways[1]), both paroxytone, inasmuch as *ας* in prosody is long; Lat. *Isaias* (*Esaias*), in Prudentius with accented *a* and short *i* (but, on the other hand, *Jeremīas*, because in this case the *e*, which is short in accordance with the Hebrew, is not suited for bearing the accent of the word). In the book itself, and throughout the Old Testament Scriptures, the prophet is called יְשַׁעְיָהוּ (in the Babylonian Codex, dating from the year 916, יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, according to the old style of writing); on the other hand, in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the shorter form designates other persons. Though the shorter form of such names was in ancient times current along with the longer, it came to be exclusively used in more recent days; hence its employment as the usual title. The name is a compound word, signifying "Jahu (Jah) has wrought salvation,"—ישע being equivalent to הוֹשִׁיעַ (in הוֹשַׁעְיָה), as רחב in רַחַבְיָה is equivalent to הֶרְחִיב — not "salvation of Jahu" (as explained, for instance, by Küper, with Caspari); for, as Köhler has shown, in the beginning of his Commentary on Zechariah, the number of the names of persons compounded of a substantive and יה is exceeded by

[1] Ἡσαΐας (or even Ἡσάϊας, following the analogy of Ἡσίοδος, Ἡσύχιος) is essentially a modification like Ἰσαΐας. There are some other proper names beginning with יֵשׁ, but the LXX. renders none of these by Ησ or Ισ, like this one. In Ezra viii. 7, 19, ישעיה is modified into the form Ἰσαΐας, and in 1 Chron. iii. 21, Neh. xi. 7, into Ἰεσίας,—a worse form.

that of those which are formed from the perfect of the Qal, and this, too, with the meaning of a derived conjugation, especially the Piël and Hiphil. Combined with יֵשַׁע, however, the name would probably take the form יְשַׁעְיָהוּ (like חִלְקִיָּה, מַלְכִּיָּה, צִדְקִיָּהוּ), and signify, "Jahu is my salvation;" hence יְשַׁעְיָה, like זְכַרְיָה, זְבַדְיָה, נְתַנְיָה, will be an exclamation of thankfulness to God made into the name of the child.[1] The prophet shows he is conscious that it was not by accident he bore this name; for הוֹשִׁיעַ, יֵשַׁע, and יְשׁוּעָה are among his favourite words,—nay, we may say, he lives and moves in the coming salvation: but יהוה is the God of salvation; this is the peculiar redemptive designation of God. The name indicates the Being who exists absolutely (*i.e.* eternally and independently), who bears witness to Himself (Ex. iii. 14), as freely and according to His own counsel determining His ways, ruling throughout the course of history, and fixing its form. This work of free grace has for its end that salvation which, beginning with Israel and working outwards, embraces and includes all mankind. The element יהו (יה) in the prophet's name has been shortened from the "tetragrammaton" יהוה by rejecting the second ה. From this abbreviation we see that the vowel *a* stood at the beginning of the divine name. According to Theodoret, it was pronounced *Ἰαβέ* by the Samaritans; this is also the pronunciation given in the Archontic list of the divine names found in Epiphanius. Jacob of Edessa, as we learn from an excursus to his Syriac translation of the *Λόγοι ἐπιθρόνιοι* of Severus of Antioch, was under the erroneous impression that the name in Hebrew was pronounced יהיה like אהיה; moreover, this ܐܗܝܗ, in the Codex Curzonianus of the Syro-Hexaplar Isaiah, is transcribed in Greek characters *HEHE* (*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xxxii. 465 ff.). The testimony hereby borne to the conclusion of the word in יָהּ is confirmed by the abbreviation into יָהוּ, which, after the analogy of similar abbreviations, has come from יַהֲוֶה, through an intermediate form יַהְוֶ. The modified form *Ἰαΐά* (found in Theodoret) does not point to the divine name יהוה (which must have been represented by *Ἰαβά*), but יה; *Ἰαῶ* with its by-forms is יָהּ, and *Ἰαωϊά* (in Origen, *contra Celsum*, i. 656) is the

[1] See Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, pp. 206–208.

condensed יהו יה.[1] The pronunciation *Jehovah* (*Yehovah*) has arisen from a combination of the *Qeri* and *Kethib*, and did not become current till after the sixteenth century; Galatinus, about 1518, in his work *de arcanis catholicae veritatis*, was the first who remarked that the "tetragrammaton," read as it is pointed, sounds *Jehovah* (*Yehovah*); from that time people began to pronounce it so, but Genebrard, who died in 1597, in his Commentary on the Psalms, continues against Beza to oppose it as an intolerable innovation: *Impii vetustatis temeratores et nominis Dei ineffabilis profanatores atque adeo transformatores* JOVA *vel* JEHOVAH *legunt, vocabulo novo, barbaro, fictitio, irreligioso et Jovem gentilium redolente.*

II. *The title of the book, given by itself.* Ver. 1: "*The vision of Yeshayahu, son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziyahu, Jotham, Ahaz, Yehizkiyahu, kings of Judah.*" Isaiah is here called בֶּן־אָמוֹץ. The Jewish doctrine, known even to the early Fathers of the Church, that when a prophet's father is named, the latter also was a prophet (*Megilla* 15*a*), is unfounded. But there is at least some sense, though no historic basis, in an old tradition repeated in the Midrash (*Pesikta de-Rab Cahana* 117*b*) and the Talmuds (*Megilla* 10*b*, cf. *Sota* 10*b*), that Amoz was the brother of Amaziah, the father and predecessor of Uzziah, and that Isaiah was thus, like the Davidic kings, a descendant of Judah and Tamar. The nature and appearance of Isaiah make a thoroughly royal impression. He speaks to kings like a king. With majestic bearing he goes to meet the magnates of his people, and of the world-power beyond. In his style, he is among the prophets what Solomon was among the kings. In all circumstances and moods, he is master of his materials, a master of language, — simply magnificent, sublime without affectation, splendid though unadorned. But this regal character had its roots somewhere else than in blood. Only this much may be said with certainty, that Isaiah was born in Jerusalem. For the character of his prophecy betokens closest intimacy with the capital: according to *Chagiga* 13*b*, he stands in relation to Ezekiel as a native of the chief city to a native of the provinces; notwithstanding his exceeding manifold prophetic missions, we never

[1] Cf. Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*, i. 183 f.

find him outside of Jerusalem; here, too, as may be seen from chap. xxii. 1, and the style of his intercourse with king Hezekiah, he lived with his wife and children in the lower part of the city; here he carried on his ministry under the four kings named in ver. 1, who are enumerated without "vav copulative;" there is the same unconnected enumeration as in the titles of the Books of Hosea and Micah. There Hezekiah is called יְחִזְקִיָּה,—almost the same form as here,—but with the simple rejection of the toneless ה. The Chronicler especially prefers the complete form,—full both at the beginning and the end,—though he also uses the rarer form הזקיהו. Roorda is of opinion that the Chronicler took this malformation from the three titles, where it is a copyist's error for וְהִזְקִיָּהוּ or וְהִזְקִיָּה; but it is also found in Jer. xv. 4 and 2 Kings xx. 10, where such an error in transcription could not possibly have taken place. Accordingly, it is not an irregular form; we must not, however, with Roorda, derive it from the Piël, but from the Qal of the verb ("strong is Jehovah"), with a connecting *i*, which occurs pretty frequently in proper names derived from verb-roots with a vowel in the middle, such as יְשִׁימְאֵל from שִׂים, 1 Chron. iv. 36.

Under the kings already mentioned Isaiah exercised his ministry, or, as it is expressed in ver. 1, saw the vision which he committed to writing in the book before us. Among the many Hebrew synonyms for seeing, חָזָה is the general expression regularly used for prophetic perception, whether the form in which the divine revelation was made to the prophet was a vision or an audible communication; in both cases he "sees" it,—distinguishing this divine message, in its supernatural objectivity, from his own conceptions and thoughts by means of the inner sense, which is designated by the term used to denote the noblest of the five external senses. The prophet accordingly is called חֹזֶה, "a seer" (at an earlier period in the language, רֹאֶה, 1 Sam. ix. 9), and prophecy is called חָזוֹן; the term נְבוּאָה, which is the cognate of נָבִיא, appears only in the latest period (thrice in Chronicles and Nehemiah). The noun חָזוֹן, indeed, is also applied to individual visions (cf. Jer. xxix. 7 with Job xx. 8, xxxiii. 15), like חִזָּיוֹן (const. חֲזִיוֹן), which is formed from חָזִי by euphonic doubling, and is more frequently used in this sense; but here, in the title to the

Book of Isaiah, the abstract meaning passes over into the still more closely related collective, indicating the whole of what is seen, *i.e.* the contents of the vision. We may not conclude, therefore, that the first part of ver. 1 was originally the superscription merely of the first prophetic address, and that it was only through the addition of the latter part that it was changed into a general title for the whole book: Vitringa held this view, and perhaps it may even be correct, but with the Chronicler (2 Chron. xxxii. 32) this חזון ישעיהו appears as the general title of the collection.

Along with Judah, Jerusalem is further specially mentioned as the object of the vision. The "perpetual Qeri" to ירשלם (יְרוּשָׁלֵם) is יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, which is hardly to be regarded as a "broken dual," *i.e.* as formed through internal change of sound, but—like עֶפְרַיִן for עֶפְרוֹן, 2 Chron. xiii. 19, and the Aramaic שֹׁמְרַיִן—a later form in which the diphthongal *ajim* or *aim* has been resolved from the original *ēm*, *ām*, *ān*. Cheyne finds in the particularizing, from Judah to Jerusalem, an indication of the fact that Isaiah was a city-prophet. But the object of the prophecies of the provincial prophet Micah is also (i. 1) marked by the mention of the capitals of both kingdoms. The advance from "Judah" to "Jerusalem" is a centralizing step; and if חזון is meant to indicate the totality of what was seen by Isaiah, this designation of the object of Isaiah's prophecies by "Judah and Jerusalem" is centralizing. For his vision extends far beyond Judah, not merely to the sister kingdom of Ephraim, but also to the Gentile nations. Within the widest circle of the nations of the world there lies the smaller one containing the peoples bordering on the Hebrews; and within this, again, there is the still smaller one of all Israel, including Samaria; within this, once more, there is the yet smaller circle of the kingdom of Judah; and all these circles include Jerusalem, because the whole history of the world, regarded in its inmost working and its final purpose, is the history of the Church of God, which has Jerusalem, the city of Jehovah's temple and the kingdom of promise, for its peculiar site. In this sense, the expression "concerning Judah and Jerusalem" is also suitable for the whole book, in which everything that the prophet sees is seen from Judah and Jerusalem, and for the sake of both, and in the interests

of both. It is more probable, however, that the latter part of ver. 1 is a more recent addition, so that the words from חזון to ירושלם thus formed the original superscription of the first address, and could only indirectly (like the names of the Books of the Pentateuch) be used as the designation of the whole book. For it is inadmissible, with Luzzatto, to take אֲשֶׁר as nominative instead of accusative (*qui* instead of *quam*, sc. *visionem*), in order to stamp the words "The Vision of Isaiah, son of Amoz," as the superscription of the first discourse, in chap. i.; the suggestion is contrary to the syntax, for חָזוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָזָה is the usual Hebrew construction of the verb with its own substantive (Ges. § 138. 1).

FIRST HALF OF THE COLLECTION OF PROPHECIES.

CHAPS. I.–XXXIX.

PART I.—PROPHECIES RELATING TO THE COURSE OF THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE ONWARDS TO HARDENING OF HEART, CHAPS. I.–VI.

Opening Discourse, regarding Jehovah's way with His Ungrateful and Rebellious People, I. 2 ff.

The prophet is standing on the fateful boundary-line between the two halves of the history of Israel. Neither by the riches of divine goodness which they experienced during the times of Uzziah and Jotham, which closely resembled those of David and Solomon, nor by the chastisements of the divine displeasure which inflicted wound upon wound, have the people allowed themselves to be brought to repentance and reflection; the divine means of training have been exhausted, and it only remains that Jehovah should let His people in their present condition be consumed in the fire, that a new people may be formed out of the gold which has stood the fiery test. At this period, so pregnant with storms, appear the prophets, like birds upon the sea, presaging the tempest, and more active than at any other epoch,—Amos in the days of Jeroboam, Micah in the reign of Jotham, but above all Isaiah, *the* prophet *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, standing midway between Moses and Christ.

Conscious of this his exalted position in the history of salvation, he begins his opening address in Deuteronomic fashion, like the grand Song of Moses in Deut. xxxii. This form has been shown by the investigations of Klostermann

(*Studien u. Krit.* 1871) to have passed current in Hezekiah's time, at latest, as a prophetic testimony reaching back to Moses, so that it may actually be regarded as such (see No. X. of my "Studies in Pentateuchal Criticism," in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift*, 1880, p. 503 ff.). This song is the compendious programme and the common watchword of all prophecy, to which it stands in the same fundamental relation as the Decalogue to all other laws, and the Lord's Prayer to all other prayers. The lawgiver therein sets before the eyes of his people their whole history to the end of time. This history falls into four great periods: the creation and exaltation of Israel; the ingratitude and apostasy of Israel; the surrender of Israel into the hands of the heathen; lastly, the restoration of Israel,—sifted but not destroyed,—and the accord of all nations to praise Jehovah, who has revealed Himself in judgment and in mercy. This fourfold division is not merely preserved in every part of the history of Israel, but it forms the distinguishing mark of the history as a whole to its remotest end. Every age of Israel has thus in that song a mirror of its present condition and future destiny. This mirror the prophets held up before their contemporaries. Thus did Isaiah. He opens his prophetic address as Moses begins his Song. Moses begins (Deut. xxxi. 1): "Hear, O ye heavens, and I will speak, and let the earth hear the words of my mouth." In what sense he calls on heaven and earth he himself tells us in Deut. xxxi. 28 f. He foresees in spirit the future apostasy of Israel, and takes heaven and earth, which will endure beyond his earthly life now drawing to a close, as witnesses of what he has to say to his people with such a prospect. In like manner,—only with the interchange of the parallel verbs שמע and האזין,—Isaiah begins, "*Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for Jehovah speaks.*" The ground of the demand is put in a general way: they are to hear because Jehovah is speaking. But what Jehovah speaks substantially agrees with that address of Jehovah which is introduced in Deut. xxxii. 20 by the expression "And he said." What Jehovah, according to the statement there, will one day have to say in His wrath, He now says through the prophet, whose present corresponds to the future of the Song of Moses. For the time has now arrived when heaven and earth,—which always exist

and are always the same, which have continued through the past history of Israel in all places and at all times,—should fulfil the duty laid on them by the lawgiver to be witnesses; and this is just the special, true, and ultimate sense in which they are required, as they were by Moses, to hear. They were present and shared in the proceedings when Jehovah gave the Law to His people; the heavens, according to Deut. iv. 36, as the place from which the voice of God issued, and the earth as the place where His great fire appeared. They were solemnly admitted to the scene when Jehovah gave to His people the choice between a blessing and a curse, life and death (Deut. xxx. 19, iv. 26). / They are now, therefore, to hear and bear witness regarding what Jehovah, their Creator and the God of Israel, has to say, and what complaints He has to make (ver. 2): "*Children have I brought up and exalted, but they have rebelled against Me.*" Though Israel is meant, Israel is not named, but the historical facts are generalized into a parable, in order that the astounding and appalling state of matters may be made more prominent. Israel is Jehovah's son (Ex. iv. 22 f.); all the members of the nation are His children (Deut. xiv. 1, xxxii. 20); He is the Father of Israel, whom He has begotten (Deut. xxxii. 6, 18). The existence of Israel as a nation, like that of other nations, is effected, indeed, by means of natural reproduction, not by spiritual regeneration; but the primary ground of Israel's origin is the supernaturally efficacious word of grace addressed to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 15 f.); and a series of wonderful dealings in grace has brought the growth and development of Israel to that point which it had attained at the Exodus from Egypt. It is in this sense that Jehovah has begotten Israel. This relation of Jehovah to Israel as His children has already, in Isaiah's time, a long time of grace behind it in the past,—the time of Israel's childhood in Egypt, the time of youth in the desert, the time of growing manhood from Joshua to Samuel; and now Joshua can say in the days of Isaiah, "I have brought up children, and exalted them." The opposite of גָּדוֹל is קָטֹן, that of רָם is שָׁפֵל. The Piël גִּדֵּל signifies to "make great," and when applied to children (as here and in 2 Kings x. 6, etc.), to "bring up" in the sense of natural growth; and the Pilel רוֹמֵם,

which is used also in xxiii. 4, Ezek. xxxi. 4 (cf. the proper names in 1 Chron. xxv. 29–31), as the parallel to גִּדַּל, signifies to "exalt" in the dignitative sense of raising to a high position, to which wise love of a father gradually advances a child. The two verses depict the condition of mature manhood and high honour which Israel had reached under the monarchy of David and Solomon, and which has again been enjoyed under Uzziah and Jotham. But how ungrateful were they towards God for what they owed to Him,—"but they have broken away from me!" Instead of an adversative particle (אֲבָל possibly), there is merely ו copulative, used energetically, as in vi. 7 (cf. וְהֵם, Hos. vii. 13). Two things that ought never to have been conjoined,—the gracious and filial relation of Israel to Jehovah, and Israel's base apostasy from Jehovah,—these, though utterly contradictory, were now actually combined. The verb פָּשַׁע, نسف (here with retracted tone,[1] from the presence of the following בִּי), in accordance with its radical idea, signifies to "break away, break loose" (Lat. *dirumpere*, as in *amicitiam dirumpere*),[2] and is followed by ב with the object forming the completion of the action; it means violently and determinedly to break connection with any one, and is here used of the inward severance from God, and renunciation of His claims, which forms the climax of חַטָּאת (Job xxxiv. 37), and of which the full outward manifestation is idolatry. From the time that Solomon, towards the end of his reign, gave himself up to idolatry, the worship of idols had never wholly ceased, even in public, down to the days of Isaiah. Two attempts had been made to put an end to it,—the reformation begun by Asa and completed by Jehoshaphat, and afterwards the one accomplished by Joash during the lifetime of the high priest Jehoiada, who had

[1] Only in the following cases is there no retraction of the tone: (1) When the syllable to which it would be retracted is a closed syllable; (2) When the former of the two logically connected words ends with a heavy suffix; (3) When the final syllable of this word is closed and accented, as in הֲקִים לוֹ.

[2] In Arabic, نسف originally had a purely sensuous meaning, and it is expressly remarked that it received an ethical sense only through Islam; it is the proper word for breaking the fruit by bursting open the husk.

preserved him and brought him up; the first, however, had not been able wholly to abolish idolatry altogether, and what had been removed by Joash returned with redoubled abominations as soon as Jehoiada was dead. Hence the expression, "they have broken away from me," which sums up the whole of Israel's ingratitude in the one culminating sin, applies to the entire history of the nation from the zenith of glory under David and Solomon down to the time of the prophet.

In ver. 3 Jehovah now complains of the apostasy with which His children have rewarded Him as inhuman,—nay, worse than that which would be shown by the brutes: "*An ox knoweth his owner, and an ass the crib of its master,—Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.*" A ploughing ox has a knowledge of its purchaser and owner (קֹנֵהוּ), to whom it willingly submits; and an ass, the domestic animal of proverbial stupidity (in the East also; see *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xl. 266 f.), has a knowledge at least of the crib of its master (בְּעָלָיו, a plural of excellence, as in Exod. xxi. 29,—a degenerate species of the "extensive" plural, as distinguished from the "multiplicative" plural), *i.e.* it knows that it is its master who puts its fodder into the manger (אֲבוּס—from אָבַס, to fatten cattle—with ־ֻ instead of ־ֻּ, like the forms אֲטוּן, אֲמוּן). No such knowledge has Israel,—neither direct, like instinct, nor indirect, acquired by reflection (הִתְבּוֹנָן). The expressions לא ידע and לא התבונן cannot be taken here (as for example in lvi. 10; Ps. lxxxii. 5) in an objectless sense, and as indicating a state or condition,——as if the meaning were, "they are ignorant and inconsiderate," but the object is implied in what precedes, and the words mean "they know not, consider not what, on their side, corresponds to the owner and to the manger which the master fills,"—namely, that they are the children and the property of Jehovah, and their existence and prosperity solely depend on the grace of Jehovah (Jer. v. 24, cf. Hos. ii. 10). The parallel, with its many contrasts, like the similar one in Jer. viii. 7, where animals are again introduced, explains itself even through the employment of "Israel" and "my people." Those who, in knowledge and gratitude, are far surpassed and put to shame by the brutes, are not a nation like any other nation among men, but "Israel," descendants of Jacob, who

wrestled with and overcame the wrath of God, and by wrestling also obtained the blessing for himself and his posterity; they are "my people" too,—those whom Jehovah has chosen out of all peoples to be the people of His possession, and most especial care and direction. This people, bearing the honoured name—bestowed by God Himself—of one who was a hero of faith and prayer,—this favoured people of Jehovah lowered itself far beneath the level of the brutes. Such is the complaint poured out before heaven and earth by the noble speaker.

The piercing cry of complaint by the deeply-pained Father is at the same time the heaviest impeachment. But the cause of God is to the prophet the cause of a friend who feels the grief of his friend as he would feel his own (v. 1). Hence the complaint of God now changes into strong invective and threatening on the part of the prophet; and in conformity with the deep indignation by which he is moved, his discourse in verse 4 moves rapidly along like a lightning storm, giving forth flash upon flash. The address consists of seven members, not formally connected, but so arranged as to form a climax, and each is composed of but two or three words: "*Woe to the sinful nation, the guilt-laden people, the miserable race, the children acting corruptly! They have forsaken Jehovah, blasphemed the Holy One of Israel, turned away backwards!*" The distinction attempted between הוֹי and אוֹי, making the former to signify "Oh!" and the latter "Woe!" is untenable; for, with some doubtful exceptions, הוֹי also is an exclamation of pain, and here not so much a calling down of woe (*vae genti*, as Jerome renders it), as a lamentation (*vae gentem*), but one that is filled with wrath. The appellations of Israel which follow point to what the nation ought to be in accordance with the divine choice and determination, and express what, through its own choice and self-determination in opposition to God, it has become. (1.) According to the divine choice and determination, Israel should be a "holy nation," Ex. xix. 6, but it is a "sinful nation" (*gens peccatrix*, as the Vulgate correctly translates); for חֹטֵא here is not so much a participle as a participial adjective, signifying what is habitual,—the usual singular to the plural חַטָּאִים, ἁμαρτωλοί, the singular of which is not in common use, and occurs

only once (Amos ix. 8) in the feminine as an adjective. "Holy" and "sinful" are sharp contrasts, for קָדוֹשׁ signifies that which is separated from what is common, unclean, sinful, and superior to it. At the same time, the alliteration in גּוֹי הוֹי (with *Pasek*, to preserve the independence of the two words, whose sound is so similar) is intended to produce the impression that the nation as sinful is a nation of woe. (2.) In the Law, besides being called גּוֹי קָדוֹשׁ, Israel is called עַם יְהוָה (Num. xvii. 6), the people chosen and highly favoured by Jehovah; but it is עַם כֶּבֶד עָוֹן, a people heavy with iniquity. כֶּבֶד is the construct from כָּבֵד, "heavy," like עֶרֶל from עָרֵל; the form כְּבַד is usually employed with the meaning of "clumsy" (Ex. iv. 10); and besides, the dissyllabic form sounds more rhythmically. Instead of employing the readiest descriptive expression, "a people of heavy iniquity," the property of the iniquity (the weight) is attributed to the people themselves upon whom it lies as a burden,—in accordance with the view that he who carries a heavy burden is himself so much the heavier (cf. *gravis oneribus* in Cicero). עָוֹן is always the word employed whenever sin is meant to be indicated as heavy and coarse (*e.g.* in xxxiii. 24; Gen. xv. 16, xix. 15), and when there is further included the idea of the guilt incurred by it. From being the people of Jehovah, they have become a people heavily laden with the guilt of sin. In this way the true nature of Israel has been crushed, and changed into its opposite. We translate גּוֹי by "nation," and עַם by "people," because the former (from גָּוָה) is the mass of individuals who have been joined together through one common descent, language, and country, whereas עַם (from עָמַם, חָמַם, "to combine") is the people joined together by unity of government (cf. for instance Ps. cv. 13); hence we always read of the "people of Jehovah" (עַם יְהוָה), not the "nation of Jehovah" (גּוֹי יְהוָה); and גּוֹי, free from every slur, occurs only twice (Zeph. ii. 9; Ps. cvi. 5), with a suffix referring to Jehovah, but here it is used as in Mal. iii. 9. (3.) Israel elsewhere bears the honourable title of the seed of the patriarch (xli. 8, xlv. 19, cf. Gen. xxi. 12); in reality, however, it is a seed of evil-doers (xiv. 20, cf. xxxi. 2). The idea of a similar descent, contained in זֶרַע, goes back to that of a like

inherited nature (lxv. 23; Prov. xi. 21); and מְרֵעִים does not mean the fathers, but the contemporaries of the prophet (the genitive being intended to be taken attributively),—a race consisting of miscreants. The singular of the noun מְרֵעִים is מֵרֵעַ, with the sharpening of מֵרַע with Pathach, which is usual in ע״ע verbs with guttural radicals; מֵרֵעַ (with Kamez in pause, ix. 16, which see) is a Hiphil participial noun. (4.) The children of Israel are, in virtue of the divine act, "children of Jehovah," Deut. xiv. 1; but through their own doings they are בָּנִים מַשְׁחִיתִים, "children acting corruptly;" what the Law had dreaded and predicted had thus come to pass: Deut. iv. 16, 25, xxxi. 29. In all these passages the Hiphil is found, and in the parallel passages of the grand song, Deut. xxxii. 5, the Piël שִׁחֵת, both of which conjugations contain within themselves the object of the action (Ges. § 53. 2): these verbs thus signify to do something destructive, to act in such a way that one becomes a cause of ruin to himself and others. That the degeneration of the children is meant to be regarded in relation to Jehovah, and not to their forefathers,—the opinion of Rosenmüller, who follows Vitringa,—is evident from the latter part of ver. 2, cf. xxx. 1, 9. After the four exclamatory clauses, there follow—making up the saddening seven—three declaratory clauses describing Israel's apostasy as complete. There is apostasy in disposition: "they have forsaken Jehovah." There is apostasy in words: "they blaspheme the Holy One of Israel." נִאֲצוּ (properly, "to sting," then "to mock, treat with contempt"), used of blasphemy, is an old Mosaic word; see Deut. xxxi. 20; Num. xiv. 11, 23, xvi. 30. "The Holy One of Israel" is a title designedly applied to God here; it is the keynote of Isaianic prophecy, and first sounded in this passage (see under vi. 3). To mock what is holy is in itself sinful; it is doubly a sin to mock God the Holy One; it is trebly a sin that Israel mocks God the Holy One, who has set Himself to be the Sanctifier of Israel, and who, as He is the holiness of Israel, so also, in conformity with His holiness, seeks to be sanctified by Israel (Lev. xix. 2, etc.). And lastly, their apostasy is also apostasy in their way of acting: "they have turned away backwards." In the Niphal נָזוֹר, which occurs only here, there is contained the

idea of deliberateness in their estrangement from God: the expression of this is still further intensified by employing אָחוֹר (which is added emphatically, instead of מֵאַחֲרָיו). Their conduct should be an imitation of Jehovah's; but they have turned the back to Him, and entered on the path chosen by themselves.

In ver. 5, which now follows, it is, first of all, doubtful regarding the meaning of עַל־מֶּה (מֶּה, as in Ps. x. 13, iv. 3, with ֫ even in cases where no guttural follows, after עַל, as after עַד, Ps. iv. 3; יַעַן, Hag. v. 9; and thrice לָמָּה, 1 Sam. i. 8; see on Prov. xxxi. 2; cf. König, *Lehrgeb.* p. 143), whether it signifies "why," as the LXX., Targum, Syriac, Rashi, Kimchi, Hitzig, and now also Cheyne take it, or "on what," *i.e.* "on which part of the body" (Jerome, *Saadias*), a view for which Ewald, Knobel, and Schröring (in Part 2 of his *Jesaian. Studien*) decide. Reuss also translates, *où vous frappera-t-on encore?* Luzzatto considers the latter rendering insipid, especially because a member of the body that has already been smitten can be repeatedly struck again; but he thinks the meaning is that there is no judgment which had not already fallen on Israel, so that it is no longer far from utter ruin. Nevertheless, we decide with Caspari for the meaning "to what" (*i.e.* for what end)? For in all the other (fourteen) passages in which על־מה occurs, it has this meaning, once even along with הֲבָה, Num. xxii. 32 (cf. Prov. xvii. 26), and the people do not come to be viewed as a body till ver. 6, whereas the interrogative, "upon what," would require the reader or hearer to presuppose it even here. But in translating עַל־מֶּה by "to what end," we do not understand it (as Malbim does, for instance) in the sense of *cui bono?* with the idea underlying the question, that it would certainly be fruitless, as all smiting hitherto has proved,—for this thought is not, as we should expect, directly expressed,—but after the analogy of questions with למה (Ezek. xviii. 31; Jer. xliv. 7; cf. the comment. on Eccles. v. 5, vii. 16 f.), *qua de causa?* with the underlying thought that this continual calling forth of divine chastisement is certainly a mad desire for one's own destruction. Accordingly, we render the first part of ver. 5: "*Why do you wish always to be smitten, increasing your rebellion?*" עוֹד (with *Tiphcha*, a stronger disjunctive than

Tebîr, cf. Ezek. xix. 9) belongs to תְּכֵּנּוּ; but תֻּכּוּ without עוֹד would make it appear as if they had not yet been smitten for their apostasy hitherto. There are not two interrogative clauses on the same plane (as Luzzatto thinks), as if the meaning were, "Why do ye wish to be smitten afresh? Why do ye add revolt?" Nor is the second clause the answer to the first, to which it assigns the reason (as Nägelsbach thinks), "For what (for what purpose) should ye be smitten still more? Ye heap rebellion on rebellion;" but the second clause is subordinated to the first, an adverbial secondary clause more closely defining the main proposition, as in v. 11, xxx. 31, cf. Ps. lxii. 5 ("delighting in lies"), iv. 3 ("while ye love vain show"); also Ps. v. 10, xxvii. 27; see Ewald's *Hebrew Syntax*, § 341*b* [Eng. transl. pp. 240, 241]. The LXX. has *προστιθέντες ἀνομίαν*. סָרָה (a fem. partic. used as a noun, with neuter sense) is deviation from truth and rectitude; here, as pretty frequently elsewhere, it means disloyalty to Jehovah, who is the absolutely Good and absolute Goodness. It is difficult to decide whether כָּל־רֹאשׁ and כָּל־לֵבָב signify "every head," "every heart," or, as Ewald and others think, "the whole head," "the whole heart." כָּל, followed by an indeterminate singular, sometimes signifies completeness, as in ix. 11, "with whole mouth;" Ezek. xxxvi. 5, "with joy of the whole heart;" 2 Kings xxiii. 3, "with whole heart and with whole soul;" also Ezek. xxix. 7, "the whole shoulder . . . the whole loins." More usually, however, כָּל, with an indeterminate genitive of parts of the body, signifies "each," "every" (*quisque*, not *totus*), xv. 2, xlv. 23; Jer. xlviii. 37; Ezek. vii. 17 f., xxi. 12. It is thus most natural, syntactically, to translate the latter part of ver. 5, "every head is diseased, and every heart is sick;" this rendering is also most in accord with the circumstances, inasmuch as the words in the first part of the verse are not addressed to the people as a whole, but as a multitude made up of individuals. The ל at the beginning of לַחֳלִי indicates the state or condition into which a person or thing has come: "every head is in a diseased condition;" see Ewald, § 217*d*: *lâchŏli* (this, in spite of König, *Lehrgeb.* p. 106 f., is the pronunciation intended), without the article, as in 2 Chron. xvi. 18; cf. בַּעֲנִי, 1 Sam. i. 11; the form with the article would need to be לַחֳלִי. What is meant

is disease arising from a wound caused by a blow (as in Jer. x. 19, v. 3). The prophet asks his fellow-countrymen why they are so mad as to continue calling forth the judgments of God, which have already fallen on them stroke upon stroke, through their heaping one apostasy on another. Are matters already so far gone with them that, among the many heads and hearts, there is no longer a head that has not fallen into a diseased condition, and no heart which is not thoroughly sick (דַּוָּי, an intensive form, from דָּוֶה)? Head and heart are named as the noblest portions of the outer and the inner man: outwardly and inwardly, every individual of the nation has already been smitten by the wrath of God, so that they have enough, and might have been brought to bethink themselves.

Considering this utterly miserable condition of every individual of the nation, the view (in ver. 6) of the whole people as a miserably diseased body does not come on us unexpectedly: "*From the sole of the foot to the head, there is nothing sound in it,—sears, and weals, and festering wounds: they have not been pressed out, or bound up, nor has there been any softening with oil.*" In the body of the nation, to which (or to the people as a whole) reference is made by בּוֹ, "in it," —the address now passing into objective form,—there is nothing healthy (מְתֹם from תָּמַם, not, as in Judg. xx. 48, from מַת with the root מָתָה); it is covered with wounds of various kinds, inflicted at different times; and for the healing of these many and manifold wounds, which all together, close on one another, one on the other, cover the body of the nation, no kind of means has been employed. פֶּצַע (from פָּצַע, to cleave, tear open) is a wound made by tearing the flesh, as by a sword-stroke: this required binding up (Ezek. xxx. 21), that the gaping flesh might close again; חַבּוּרָה (from חָבַר = حبر, to be striped) is a swollen stripe or lump, such as is caused by the stroke of a whip or a blow of the fist; this required softening with oil, in order that the coagulated matter or the swelling might disperse; מַכָּה טְרִיָּה is the still fresh and bleeding wound, which needed pressing out to cleanse it, and thus facilitate healing. The three predicates, in relation to the ideas presented in the subjects, show an approximation to a chiasm. The predicates are plural in form, owing to the subjects being taken collectively; the expression וְלֹא רֻכְּתָה בַּשֶּׁמֶן,

which, as regards its meaning, refers to חבורה, is accordingly to be understood as a neuter construction, and to be rendered, "nor has softening with oil been effected." Considering the Pual near it, זֹרוּ might also appear to be of the same conjugation, but actually is not, because, according to the accentuation (with two *Pashtas*, the first of which, as in תֹּהוּ, Gen. i. 2, marks the place of tone, so that the form here is to be pronounced *zóru*), it has the tone on the penult,—a fact for which (in spite of what Stade says, § 415) no reason could be perceived, if the form were from the verb זָרָה. For the assumption that the tone is retracted in order to prepare us for the heavy incidence of the tone in חֻבָּשׁוּ (Ewald, § 194*c*) is quite arbitrary; for, though the influence of the Pause sometimes reaches to the second last word, it does not extend to the third last. Moreover, according to the usage of the language, זָרָה signifies "to be dispersed," not "to be pressed out," whereas זוּר and זָרַר are commonly used in the sense of pressing together, and pressing out. Hence זֹרוּ (like בֹּשׁוּ) is either the Qal of a middle-vowel intransitive verb זוֹר, or (more probably)—because the middle-vowel verb זוּר in Ps. lviii. 4 has another meaning ("they are estranged;" cf. נָזוּרוּ above, in ver. 4)—the Qal of זָרַר (= זרר, *constringere*), which is here inflected as an intransitive verb, and in a measure corresponding to the Arabic passive of the Qal زُرَّ (Olsh. § 245. 1); cf. Job xxiv. 24, רָמוּ, and Gen. xlix. 23, the actively used רָבוּ. The surgical treatment, so highly necessary for the nation, is a figurative representation of the pastoral address of the prophet, which, though certainly published, was as if it had not been published, inasmuch as its salutary effect was conditioned by repentance on the part of the nation. The people despised God's offer of service like that of the good Samaritan (Luke x. 34). They did not like the radical cure of which the prophets made offer. The view of the body as diseased within and wholly lacerated without was thus all the more calculated to excite compassion. The prophet speaks of the existing condition of things. He says that it has already come to the worst with the people, and this is precisely the ground and the subject of his inculpatory complaints. Hence, when he passes in ver. 7 from figurative to literal

language (like ver. 23 after 22), it is to be perceived that he is there also speaking of what was then present.

The body thus internally and externally disorganized was, properly speaking, the people and the country in the frightful condition described in ver. 7, which begins in the most comprehensive manner, and closes in the same way: "*Your country —a waste! your cities—burned with fire! your arable land—before your eyes strangers are devouring it, and a desert like an overthrowing by strangers.*" Caspari (in his *Beiträge zur Einl. in das Buch Jesaia*, p. 204) has pointed out how nearly every word here corresponds to the threatenings of a curse in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. (xxix.). The designation given by the prophet to the foes who have devastated the country reduced its cities to ashes, and seized its harvest, is simply זָרִים, "strangers," or barbarians (cf. Festus: *hostis apud antiquos peregrinus dicebatur*), without mentioning their nationality. He abstracts from the historic definiteness of the present, in order the more impressively to show that it bears the character of the curse which was predetermined. The climactic expression for this is, that—as stated in the noun-clause at the end of ver. 7, which goes back to repeat what was previously said—there has been wrought a desolation, כִּמְהֵפֵכַת זָרִים, "like an overthrow of foreigners." This emphatic repetition of a catchword in a verse, seen here in the case of זָרִים, is a figure of speech (called *epanaphora*) common to the two halves of the collection: Ewald, Studer, Lagarde, and Cheyne, reading כִּמְהֵפֵכַת סְדֹם, mistake this peculiarity of Isaiah's writings. It is a question, however, whether, with Caspari, Knobel, and Nägelsbach, זָרִים is to be taken as a subjective genitive, in which case the clause would mean "like an overthrow such as barbarians usually cause;" or whether we should, with Hitzig, Luzzatto, and others, regard the word as an objective genitive, and render the expression, "like an overthrow such as is wont to befall barbarians." As מַהְפֵּכָה, in conformity with the primary passage in Deut. xxix. 22, in all other places where it occurs, designates the overthrow of Sodom, Gomorrah, etc. (xiii. 19; Amos iv. 11; Jer. l. 40), that was accomplished by God, and seeing that Isaiah also, as ver. 8 shows, has this catastrophe in his mind, we decide for the view that זָרִים, like רְשָׁעִים in Prov. xii. 7, is the objective

genitive: this view is further rendered more probable by the form of the noun, which points to a state or condition rather than an action (cf. מְדֻרָגָה, מַכְשֵׁלָה, מַשְׁטֵמָה); in this way also the בְּ, marking the comparison, becomes more significant. The prophet means to say that the desolation which has befallen the country of the people of God is like such complete ruin (*subversio*) as God sends on nations which stand outside of the covenant-relation (cf. Eph. ii. 14), and which, like the people of the Pentapolis, are utterly destroyed by Him, leaving no trace behind.

But, as declared in vers. 8, 9, there is merely similarity, not identity. Jerusalem is still preserved, but in how sad a condition! There is no doubt that in ver. 8 "the daughter of Zion" means Jerusalem. The genitive in the expression בַּת־צִיּוֹן is that of apposition, so that "daughter of Zion" is equivalent to "daughter Zion;" cf. בְּתוּלַת בַּת־צִיּוֹן, xxxvii. 22, where annexion comes in twice, instead of apposition (Ges. § 128. 2*d*). Zion itself is represented as a daughter, *i.e.* as a woman. Such is the name applied, first of all, to the townspeople dwelling round the fortress of Zion, to which the individual inhabitants of the city are related as children to their mother, inasmuch as the community sees its members from time to time coming into existence and growing up, and those who are thus born within her are, as it were, born of her and brought up by her; but, in the next instance, the name is also applied to the city itself, either including or excluding (cf. Jer. xlvi. 19, xlviii. 18; Zech. ii. 11) the inhabitants,—here, however, as shown in ver. 9, these are included. This is precisely the point of the first two comparisons. "*And the daughter of Zion is left remaining like a booth in a vineyard, like a night-hut in a cucumber-field.*" The vineyard and the cucumber field are considered by the prophet in their condition before the harvest (not *after*, as the Targums represent it), during which they need to be watched; hence the point of the comparison is this, that throughout the vineyard and the cucumber field not a single human being is to be seen, and that nothing but the booth and the night hut[1] show, nevertheless, that such a being has his abode here.

[1] The picture of "a lodge in a garden of cucumbers," in Thomson's *Land and the Book*, shows four poles covered above with boughs, and with

So stands Jerusalem in the midst of a far-reaching desolation, —a sign, however, that the country was not wholly depopulated.

But what is the meaning of the third of the comparisons? Hitzig renders, "like a watch-tower;" Knobel, "like a guard-city;" Reuss (who, however, would rather expunge the words, which he considers a gloss), "comme un lieu de garde;" but though נְצוּרָה may mean a guard, a watch, עִיר cannot mean a tower. And for the rendering which most readily presents itself, "like a guarded city" (*i.e.* a city preserved from danger), the כְּ of comparison is unsuitable. Nor is it admissible to take the first two כְּ in the sense of *sicut*, and the third in the sense of *sic;* for this correlative כְּ is usual only in clauses indicating identity, not in those properly signifying comparison. Weir's conjecture, that the reading should be כָּעִיר פְּרוּצָה (Prov. xxv. 28; 2 Chron. xxxii. 5), is ingenious: this would make the clause mean "like a city (with walls) broken through,"—hence, defenceless; but there is no need for this conjecture. We translate, "like a blockaded city," deriving נְצוּרָה here, as in Prov. vii. 10, from נָצַר,—not, with Luzzatto, from צוּר, *Ni.* נָצוֹר, fem. נְצוּרָה (which is not in use, and, moreover, in this obscured feminine form, cannot be proved to exist; see Stade, § 78*a*), and after the LXX., with Strachey, rendering the words "like a besieged city." נָצַר signifies to observe with keen eye (cf. מַטָּרָה, and נטר, *observare*, with נטר, *custodire*), with good intention, or (as in Job vii. 20) with hostile design; it may thus, like the synonymous terms in 2 Sam. xi. 16, Jer. v. 6, be used of the investment of a city. Jerusalem was not actually blockaded when the prophet uttered his predictions, but it was just like a blockaded city, inasmuch as between such a town and the blockading enemy there is a desolate and uninhabited space, in the midst of which the city lies in silence and solitude, shut up within itself. The citizens do not venture forth; while the enemy, on account of the missiles of the citizens, do not hazard an approach into the near vicinity of the walls; in the suburbs

a floor for the watcher, raised somewhat above the ground: the whole thus forms a hut open on all sides. A fuller description is given by Wetzstein in our *Commentary on Job* (2nd edition), p. 348.

everything has been laid waste, partly by the citizens, that the enemy may not find anything useful,—partly by the enemy, who, for instance, fell the trees. Thus, in spite of all the joy that might be felt at the preservation of Jerusalem, the city wears a cheerless aspect; it looks as if it were in a state of blockade. That we must explain the passage in this way, with Caspari, is shown by Jer. iv. 16 f., where the actual storming of Jerusalem is predicted, and the enemy—probably with reference to this comparison by Isaiah (see Hitzig on the passage in Jeremiah)—are called נֹצְרִים.

For the present, Israel has still been spared the worst: the omnipotence of God has graciously prevented it. "*Unless Jehovah of Hosts had left us a little of what escaped, we should have become as Sodom, we should be like Gomorrah,*" ver. 9. שָׂרִיד (for which the LXX. and Rom. ix. 29, with a regard to vi. 13, has *σπέρμα*) is also in Deut. ii. 34, etc., what escapes by flight from defeat and destruction: and, according to the accents, כִּמְעָט is to be taken with שָׂרִיד, so that these two words will mean "an escaped remnant, which is nothing more than a trifle:" on this noun-use of מְעָט, cf. xvi. 14; 2 Chron. xii. 7; Prov. x. 20; Ps. cv. 12. Looking at Ps. lxxxi. 14 f., cf. Job xxxii. 32 (where the conditional clause is easily supplied), one might be inclined to place כִּמְעָט in the apodosis, and render it "we would almost . . .;" but considering the accentuation actually before us, the inference is more strictly logical. The designation יהוה צבאות occupies a strongly emphatic position in the front. It would have been all over with Israel long ago but for the compassion of God (cf. Hos. xi. 8); and because it is the omnipotence of God which set in motion the will of His compassion, He is called יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, "Jehovah (the God of) the heavenly hosts," —a title in which צְבָאוֹת is a governed genitive,—not, as Cheyne and Luzzatto think, in accordance with the analogy of אֱלֹהִים, an independent name of God.[1] The prophet says "us" and "we:" he is himself an inhabitant of Jerusalem; and even if he had not been such, he is, nevertheless, an Israelite:

[1] That צְבָאוֹת does not indicate the hosts of Israel (which was the view of R. José in *Shabuoth* 35*b*), but the powers of nature subject to God, I think I have shown in the essay, *Der Gottesname Jahve Zebaoth*, in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 217 ff

he therefore associates himself with his nation, like Jeremiah in Lam. iii. 22. As he has come to experience the wrath of God along with them, so he now also celebrates the mighty compassion of God which he has experienced with them. But for this compassion, the people of God would have become like Sodom, from which only four human beings escaped: they would have been like Gomorrah, which was utterly annihilated.

The address of the prophet has now reached a resting-point. That it is here divided into two sections is shown even to the eye by the space left between vers. 9 and 10. The prophet pauses after he has declared that nothing but divine compassion for Israel has prevented the utter destruction it has well deserved. He hears in spirit the remonstrance of his audience. They would fain represent the accusations which he had just uttered as unfounded, by appealing to their exact observance of the divine law; but in opposition to this ground of self-vindication which the prophet has read out of the hearts of those impeached, he but proceeds to prove the divine arraignment, which he begins in vers. 10, 11: "*Hear the word of Jehovah, ye Sodom-judges! listen to the law of our God, O Gomorrah-nation! For what purpose is the multitude of your slain offerings to me? saith Jehovah. I am sated with burnt-offerings of rams, and the suet of fatted calves; and the blood of bullocks and lambs and he-goats, I do not like.*" The second attack in the prophet's address begins, like the first in ver. 2, with "hear ye!" and "listen!" The summons to hear is in this instance (just as in the case of Isaiah's contemporary, Micah,—chap. iii.) addressed to the קְצִינֵי (from קָצָה, قَضَى, *decidere*, with the noun-ending ־ִין, see *Jeshurun*, p. 212 ff.), *i.e.* men with decisive authority, the rulers in the fullest sense, and to the people who are subject to them. It is of the mercy of God that Jerusalem still exists, for Jerusalem is *πνευματικῶς Σόδομα*, as is said regarding Jerusalem in the Apocalypse (xi. 8), with reference to this passage in Isaiah. According to Ezek. xvi. 49, pride, the lust of the flesh, and want of mercy were the chief sins of Sodom; and of these, the rulers of Jerusalem and the multitude subject to them and worthy of

them were not less guilty now. But they think they do not by any means stand in such disfavour with God, because outwardly they render satisfaction to the law. The prophet, therefore, summons them to hear the law of the God of Israel which he wishes to declare to them,—for the prophets were called to be the expounders of the law, and to announce what was truly the will and good pleasure of God; and what He requires is, not external acts of worship with no corresponding homage of heart, not ceremonial performances at all in the first instance, but freedom from sin and a course of life that flows from obedience to Him and loving sympathy with other men. "For what purpose is the multitude of your slain-offerings to me? saith Jehovah." The prophet purposely says יֹאמַר, not אָמַר, to indicate that what he declares is the constant language of God in opposition to the heartless show of reverence and the hypocritical ceremonial righteousness of Israel. The multitude of זְבָחִים, *i.e.* sacrifices of animals which they slaughtered, has no value in His eyes. As the whole worship is here examined in detail, זְבָחִים appears to denote the שְׁלָמִים, *i.e.* the "peace-offerings" or communion-offerings, with which a meal was associated, for Jehovah vouchsafed to the offerer a share in the enjoyment of what he offered. But it is better to take זְבָחִים as a general name for the bloody sacrifices, which are then divided into עוֹלוֹת and חֵלֶב; for they are partly whole-offerings, which are wholly (though piece by piece) laid on the altar and there consumed by fire, and partly those sacrifices of which only the pieces of fat were burned on the altar, viz. sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, and especially peace-offerings. Of the sacrificial animals mentioned, פָּרִים (bullocks) and מְרִיאִים (fatted calves) are species of בָּקָר (large cattle), while כְּבָשִׂים (lambs) and עַתּוּדִים (young he-goats as distinguished from שָׂעִיר, the older long-haired he-goat, the animal taken as a sin-offering) together with the אַיִל (ram; the usual whole-offering of the high priest, the tribe-prince, and the nation on all high feast-days) are species of צֹאן (smaller cattle). The blood of these sacrificial animals (such as, for example, the young bullocks, sheep, and he-goats) was, in accordance with the requirement of the law, dashed against the altar round about, in the case of the whole-offering, the peace-offering, and the trespass-offering; in the case

of the sin-offering, it was smeared on the horns of the altar, poured out at the foot of the altar, and in some instances sprinkled on the side of the altar or towards the vessels of the inner sanctuary. With such offerings Jehovah is sated, and no longer cares for them. (The two perfects here indicate what has long been and still is going on at present.)

What Jeremiah (vii. 22) says of sacrifices—that God never properly wished them—Isaiah now says, in ver. 12, regarding visits to the temple: "*When ye come to appear before my face, who hath asked this at your hand,—to tread my courts?*" לֶרְאוֹת is a contracted infinitive Niphal for לְהֵרָאוֹת, as in Ex. xxxiv. 24; Deut. xxxi. 11; cf. the similarly contracted Hiphil forms in iii. 8, xxiii. 11; on the other hand, לַעֲשֹׂר in Deut. xxvi. 12 = לְעַשֵּׂר (cf. Neh. x. 39); as כַּהֲלָכִין, Dan. ii. 35, iv. 34 = כְּהַלָּכִין. נִרְאָה פְּנֵי יְהוָה is the standing expression for the appearing of all male Israelites in the temple, in accordance with the law, at the three great feasts, but it also came to be used in speaking of visiting the temple generally (cf. Ps. xlii. 3, lxxxiv. 8). According to Ewald (§ 279*c*), פְּנֵי indicates the subject connected with the passive verb ("to be seen by the face of God"); but why is it not rather a local accusative with prepositional meaning, "before the face of" (as Nägelsbach thinks), seeing that it is used interchangeably with the prepositions לְ, אֵת, and אֶל? It is probable that לֶרְאוֹת has thus been pointed here and in Ex. xxxiv. 24, Deut. xxxi. 11, instead of לִרְאוֹת (like יֵרָאוּ, Ex. xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 20, instead of יִרְאוּ), in order to avoid speaking of "seeing God,"—an expression which is so apt to be misunderstood as meaning a vision with the eye of sense (cf. Ex. xxiv. 11, LXX. *ὤφθησαν*); unquestionably, however, the Niphal perfect stands in xvi. 12; 1 Sam. i. 22; and also יֵרָאֶה (not יִרְאֶה) in Ex. xxiii. 17; moreover, the expression, "to see the face of God," *i.e.* of Him who reveals Himself in His sanctuary, is not opposed to the religious ideas of the Old Testament, Ps. xi. 7, xxvii. 4; and in the Mishna, appearing before God at the great feasts is called רְאִיָּה and רַאָיוֹן (*Hagiga* i. 1; *Pêa* i. 1). Cheyne considers that the expression "to see the face of God" is a remnant of the old Semitic worship of God by means of sensible figures which has been transferred to the language of revealed religion: this is possible, but there is no proof that

such transition has actually occurred. Those whom Jehovah here addresses through His prophet certainly visit the temple diligently; but who has required this of their hand (*i.e.* asked this performance from them)? Jehovah certainly has not. "To tread my courts" stands in apposition with "this," which it more closely defines. Jehovah has not desired them to appear before Him; He has not asked for this lifeless and undevotional tramping thither (vii. 25, xxvi. 6; Ezek. xxvi. 11), this senseless *opus operatum*, which would better be left unperformed, as it merely desecrates the holy places, by wearing out the floors for no purpose.

Because they do not perform what Jehovah has commanded, as He has commanded it, He directly forbids them in ver. 13 to go on: "*Continue not to bring lying meat-offerings: abomination-incense is it to me.*" It is but rarely that מִנְחָה denotes an offering in general (Gen. iv. 3–5; 1 Sam. ii. 17, xxvi. 19); here, however, as throughout Malachi, the "meat-offering" (meal-offering) is meant, as is shown by the more specific term קְטֹרֶת following, which, without such an addition as is made in Ps. lxvi. 15, cannot be understood in the same way as the expression in the law, הִקְטִיר הַמְזַבֵּחָה (to consume in smoke upon the altar). The meat-offering of the people of Jerusalem is called מִנְחַת שָׁוְא (the second noun being derived from שָׁאָה=שׁוֹא, to be waste, desolate, and of like form with תֹּהוּ), as being a lifeless and hypocritical performance, having behind it nothing of the mental disposition which it appears to express (cf. Job xxxv. 13). In the second half of the verse the LXX., Jerome, Gesenius, Umbreit, Knobel, and Nägelsbach translate thus: "incense,—it is an abomination to me,"—the term "incense" being here used as the name of what was offered daily on the golden altar of the Holy Place (Ex. xxx. 8). But in no place where the prophets denounce heartless ceremonial worship is mention made of the offering of incense by the priests, and in any case it is more simple and natural to take קְטֹרֶת, not as a bare absolute case, but—what is quite allowable—in conformity with the *Darga* marking it, as a construct. The meat-offering is called "incense" because of the so-called "memorial" (אַזְכָּרָה), *i.e.* that portion of it which brought the grateful offerer in remembrance before God, and which the priest burned on the

altar,—an act which was called הַקְטִיר אַזְכָּרָתָהּ (see Lev. ii. 2; cf. Jer. xxxiii. 18); with this "memorial" also there was regularly combined incense, which was wholly—not merely in part—burned on the altar. The meat-offering, with its sweet odour, is merely the form in which gratitude for God's blessing, and earnest prayerful desire for this, manifest themselves; but in the case of these worshippers, there was only the form, without the inner spirit; the form with which they thought they have satisfied God is empty, and therefore an abomination to Him.

As little pleasure has God in their punctilious observance of the feasts: "*New moon and Sabbath, the calling of an assembly—I cannot bear iniquity and a festal crowd.*" The first object-ideas, which are logically governed by לֹא־אוּכַל (properly the imperf. Hophal, "I am unable," viz. to bear,—an ellipsis which must be supplied in the same way as in Ps. ci. 5; Jer. xliv. 23; Prov. xxx. 21), become absolute cases, inasmuch as לֹא־אוּכַל assumes another and a different object in the following אָוֶן וַעֲצָרָה. When three things are enumerated, the conjunction is readily dropped by the third, and stands only with the second: see also Deut. xxix. 22; Ps. xlv. 9; Job xlii. 9; Eccles. vii. 26. As to new moon and Sabbath (which, when joined with חֹדֶשׁ, always signifies the weekly Sabbath), and generally the convocation of assemblies of the whole community on the weekly Sabbath and high festivals, as required in Lev. xxiii.,—Jehovah cannot endure a festival associated with wickedness. עֲצָרָה (from עָצַר, to press, squeeze together) is synonymous with מִקְרָא, as shown by comparing Jonah i. 14 with 2 Kings x. 20, to which it is related in the same way as *πανήγυρις* to *ἐκκλησία*;[1] and אָוֶן (from אוּן, to breathe) is moral vileness, as the utter absence of all that has essence and value in God's sight. These two nouns are purposely placed together by the prophet. A closely packed festive gathering, and inward barrenness and emptiness on the part of those assembled,—this is a contradiction that God cannot endure.

[1] In the language of the law, the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 36; Num. xxix. 35) and the seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Deut. xvi. 8) is called עֲצֶרֶת, not from עָצַר, *cohibere, claudere*, but *constipare* (cf. Jer. ix. 1).

In ver. 14 He gives still stronger expression to His aversion: "*Your new moons and your festal seasons my soul hates; they have become a burden to me; I am weary of bearing them.*" As the soul of man, viewed as the bond between his spiritual and his bodily life, is, though not the principle of his self-consciousness, yet the centre from which he draws the circle of this self-consciousness, in order to comprehend the sum-total of his whole being, and attach it to the thought of himself as a person; so—to take a designation from man who has been made in the image of God—the "soul" of God, as indicated by נַפְשִׁי, is the centre of His being, encircled and penetrated by self-consciousness: hence, whatever the soul of God hates (cf. Jer. xv. 1) or loves (xlii. 1), that He hates or loves in the inmost depths and in the whole extent of His being. (See *Bibl. Psychology*, p. 258 of Eng. transl.) Thus He hates each and all of the festivals that are kept in Jerusalem; the beginnings of the months and the מוֹעֲדִים ("appointed feasts,"—here, as in Ezra iii. 5, applied to all the feasts on which, or on the most solemn days of which, a "holy convocation" took place) during the course of the month. These have long been to Him, who bears them, a burden, לָטֹרַח (טֹרַח being synonymous with מַשָּׂא, Deut. i. 12), so that He can no longer endure them; His patience is tired of such religious service. נִשְׂא (in Isaiah, found also in xviii. 3, for שְׂאֵת or שֵׂאת, and here for לִשְׂאֵת) has for its object the festal celebrations mentioned. Like the great variety of offerings, this variety of sacred seasons (cf. Hos. ii. 13) presupposes the existence of a law of correspondingly large extent.

Their self-righteousness, inasmuch as it rested on sacrifice and observance of feasts, is now put to shame; in ver. 15 the last and innermost bulwark of the seemingly holy nation was destroyed: "*And when ye stretch out your hands, I hide mine eyes from you: even when you pray much, I do not hear,—your hands are full of blood.*" Even their prayer is an abomination to God. Prayer is something common to man; it is the interpreter of religious thought and feeling, coming as a mediator between God and men; it is spiritual sacrifice. The law does not command prayer; apart from Deut. xxvi., it contains no form of prayer: but prayer is so natural to man as such that there was no need of any precept for this fundamental

expression of our relation to God. Hence the prophet comes to prayer last of all, in order to reduce to its nonentity their self-righteousness, which is rotten even to this last foundation.

פָּרַשׂ (= صَفَّ, فَرَشَ) or Piël פִּרַּשׂ כַּפַּיִם (used in xxv. 11 of swimming), here with *i* instead of *e* in a closed syllable, as in xxv. 1, lii. 12, etc., is the gesture of one in prayer, who spreads out his hands (the expression nowhere means "to break the hands" = wrestle), and stretches them, thus spread out, upwards to heaven or the Most Holy Place in the temple; moreover,—as if under a feeling of emptiness and need, and through the desire to receive God's gifts,—it is the inner surfaces of the hands, כַּפַּיִם (cf. *tendere palmas, e.g.* in Virgil's *Æneid*, xii. 196, *tenditque ad sidera palmas*), that are held up, though often enough יָדַיִם is interchanged with the word. If they stand before Him in this suppliant attitude, or lie upon the ground, Jehovah hides His eyes, *i.e.* His omniscience wants to know nothing of this; and though they pray ever so much and so long (גַּם כִּי, *etiamsi;* cf. the simple כִּי in Jer. xiv. 12), He is as if He were deaf to it all. We would now expect a כִּי to introduce the ground or reason; but the more excited the speaker is, so much the more brief and disconnected is his speech. The plural דָּמִים always denotes human blood shed, especially by force, and then also the bloody deed and blood-guiltiness itself; the plural points neither to the quantity nor to the separate drops, but is rather plural of the product, like חִטִּים, עֲצִים, etc. For the sake of emphasis the dreadful דָּמִים stands before its governing verb מָלְאוּ, which points to many acts of murder committed, and deeds of violence resembling these. Blood did not indeed actually adhere to their hands stretched out in prayer; but before God, from whom no outward show conceals the true nature of things, they drip with blood, though washed ever so clean.

The protest of the people against the accusations of God has now been given negatively in vers. 11–15; their work-righteous worship, defiled through unrighteous deeds and even murder itself, Jehovah will not have. The divine arraignment is next proved positively also, in vers. 16, 17, where the true righteousness which the accused had not is opposed to the false righteousness of which they boast.

Overwhelming denunciation here changes into hortatory appeal, and already there is proclaimed the love that is concealed behind the wrath, and would gladly break through. There are eight exhortations. The first three refer to the removal of evil, the other five to the performance of what is good.

The first three verses run thus: ver. 16, "*Wash yourselves, purify yourselves; remove the evil of your deeds from before mine eyes; cease to do evil.*" This is not merely an advance from figurative language to the most literal, it is also an advance even on what has been already declared. The first exhortation requires first of all, and above all, purification from the sins that have been committed, through forgiveness sought and obtained. רַחֲצוּ is here used in the frequent middle sense, λούεσθαι; and הִזַּכּוּ, with the tone on the final syllable, is not the Niphal from זָכַךְ (for the 2nd pers. plural imperat. Niphal of verbs ע״ע usually and naturally has the tone on the penult., see lii. 11, xvii. 10), but the Hithpaël from זָכָה, for הִזְדַּכּוּ, with the same assimilation of the preformative ת as in the Hithpaël אֵרוֹמָם (= *errōmām*), xxxiii. 10. In conformity with the difference between the two synonyms (to wash one's self, to purify one's self), the former is to be referred to the great act of repentance on the part of one who returns to God, the latter to the daily repentance of one who is converted. The second exhortation requires that they shall place themselves in the light of God's countenance, and put away the evil of their deeds that cannot be endured by pure eyes (Hab. i. 13). They are to wrestle against and overcome the vicious disposition to which actual sin had grown, that it may at last wholly disappear. According to its root-idea, נֶגֶד (from נָגַד, נכח, to be elevated, opp. غار, to be depressed, sunk) signifies prominence (cf. Arab. *négd*, elevated country, visible from afar), conspicuousness, so that מִנֶּגֶד is thus properly equivalent to *e conspectu*, as נֶגֶד is *in conspectu*: regarding מֵעֲלָל, see under iii. 4.

The five exhortations pointing to the practice of what is good, are in ver. 17: "*Learn to do good, take an interest in judgment, set the oppressor right, pronounce the sentence of the orphan, plead the cause of the widow.*" The first exhortation is the fundamental one: they are to learn to do good,—a

difficult art in which one does not become a master merely through good intentions. The inf. absol. הֵיטֵב is regarded as the accusative of the לִמְדוּ; and הָרֵעַ in ver. 16 (for which we might also have לָהָרֵעַ) similarly takes the place of the object: such employment of this infinitive as a noun is not very rare, see vii. 15 f., xlii. 54, lvii. 20; Jer. ix. 4. That this primary exhortation now branches out into four minor ones referring to the administration of justice, is accounted for by the fact that no other prophet directs so keen an eye upon affairs of state and judicial proceedings as Isaiah. In this respect he differs from his younger contemporary Micah, whose character is more generally ethical, while Isaiah's is largely political. Hence the exhortations: "apply yourselves to judgment,"—דָּרַשׁ signifying to devote one's self zealously and carefully to a thing; then: "bring the oppressor to the right way." So we must render the words; for חָמוֹץ (from חָמַץ, to be sharp in taste, dazzling in appearance, violent or furious in disposition) cannot well mean him who is oppressed, injured in his rights, as most of the old translators have rendered it (LXX. *ἀδικούμενον*, Targ. דַּאֲנִיס, "who is oppressed"). The form קָטוֹל certainly may have a stative meaning closely connected with the passive, and marking a high degree (as shown by חָגוֹר, "provided with a girdle," in relation to חָגוּר, "girded;" plur. חֲגוֹרֵי, Ezek. xxxiii. 15); but more frequently it has an active sense, like חָסוֹן (see ver. 31), בָּגוֹד, Jer. iii. 7, 10; עָשׁוֹק, Jer. xxii. 3, and the Qamez is then unchangeable (hence fem. בָּגוֹדָה), after the manner of the Arabic form فاعول (*fâ'ûl*). Such is the meaning here; for the Piël אַשֵּׁר signifies neither to make happy nor to strengthen (Luzzatto renders *rianimate chi è oppresso*),—nor is the latter its meaning in the Talmud, where it rather signifies to confirm or ratify,—but either to pronounce a person happy or fortunate (the verb being in this case a denominative from אַשְׁרֵי, like *μακαρίζειν*), a meaning which is quite unsuitable here; or, as in iii. 2, ix. 15 (cf. Prov. xxiii. 19), to lead in the right way; or, to make any one keep the straight course. In this way, then, חָמוֹץ will have the intensified signification of חוֹמֵץ, Ps. lxxi. 4, *i.e.* it will mean a violent, regardless, heartless man; and אַשְּׁרוּ חָמוֹץ will signify, "show the violent man the way of righteousness:" the

expression does not point so much to punishment and rendering harmless, as to correction and improvement, Ps. lxxii. 4.[1] Next follow two exhortations referring to widows and orphans: these, with the stranger, are under very special protection, the objects of care by God and His law; see Ex. xxii. 21, cf. 20. "Pronounce the sentence of the orphan" (שְׁפֹט, as in Deut. xxv. 1, is abbreviated from שְׁפֹט מִשְׁפַּט פ׳); for, if no decision and verdict is pronounced in their case, this is the most outrageous unrighteousness, inasmuch as not even the form and appearance of justice are preserved. "Plead the cause of the widow," the imperative רִיב, with the accusative of a person (a construction which is further found only in li. 22), is a condensed expression for רִיב רִיב פ׳, to plead and maintain the cause of any one. Thus the reasonings adduced in self-defence by the hearts of the accused are refuted, both negatively and positively. They are thunderstruck and put to shame. The law announced in ver. 10 has been preached to them. The prophet has thrown aside the husks of their dead works, and revealed the moral kernel of the law in its universal application to all mankind.

Jehovah has been addressing His people in anger, but even in the exhortations of vers. 16, 17 His love had begun to move. This love, which seeks not the destruction of Israel, but their inward and outward salvation, now breaks forth in ver. 18: "*Come now, and let us reason together, saith Jehovah: if your sins come out like scarlet clothes, they shall become white like snow: if they be red like crimson, they shall come out like wool.*" Cheyne translates: "let us bring our dispute to an end," and thus interprets away the offer of free grace, but without giving any reason for the possibility of this rendering. Wellhausen also sets it aside by taking the latter part of ver. 18 as a question ("If . . . should they become white?"). But it is always a very precarious makeshift to regard such clauses as questions without any interrogatory sign, when there is no necessity for a resort to this expedient; the Hiphil הוֹכִיחַ certainly may signify to

[1] It is an instructive fact, throwing light on the meaning of the word, that in the Talmud (*Joma* 39*b*) a person who had usurped not merely his own inheritance but that of another, bore the nickname of בֶּן חמוֹצָן through life.

"decide;" the Niphal נוֹכַח, however, does not mean to "bring a lawsuit to an end," but to carry on litigation with another, Job xxiii. 7 (in post-Biblical Hebrew, הִתְוַכֵּחַ), syn. נִשְׁפַּט, xliii. 26. In this litigation it will be made clear that no kind of guilt lies on the side of Jehovah, but that the righteousness which Israel could vindicate for themselves is but a semblance of righteousness, and this seeming righteousness, properly regarded, is blood-stained unrighteousness. It is assumed that the investigation can have no other result than this; hence Israel is worthy of death. Jehovah, however, does not wish to deal with Israel in accordance with His retributive justice, but according to His free mercy and compassion (cf. the expression pointing to "grace alone" in xliii. 25, and further, Micah vii. 18 f.). He is willing to remit the punishment, and not merely to regard the sin as if it were not, but even to change it into its opposite. Sin of the brightest red dye is by His grace to become the purest white. On the two Hiphils indicating colour, see Gesen. § 53. 2, where the signification was formerly stated to be, to assume a colour, or rather to give out (or emit rays of) colour, —not *colorem accipere*, but *colorem dare*. שָׁנִי signifies clear or bright red (from שָׁנָה=שׁאן, to be bright, glisten), not *δίβαφον* (from שָׁנָה, to do twice, viz. to dye twice; for it is in the case of purple that the double dyeing can be proved, not in the case of crimson). שָׁנִים (cf. our remarks on Prov. xxxi. 21) are not materials which have been dyed twice, but those which have been dyed with שָׁנִי, "bright red." תּוֹלָע (here and in Lam. iv. 5), a worm = worm-dye, is the name of the same dye-stuff,—that of the crimson obtained from the coccus-insect of the *quercus coccifera* and other plants,—the *color coccinus*. In the middle books of the Pentateuch the colouring matter is called תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי; and where mention is made of wool dyed this colour, the expression used is שְׁנִי תּוֹלַעַת (Lev. xiv.; Num. xix.): here and in Prov. xxxi. 21, שָׁנִים are scarlet clothes,—the plural from the singular which is used in the same sense in 2 Sam. i. 24, Jer. iv. 30, along with which תּוֹלָע (worm-dyed cloth) is employed.[1] Jerome has translated

[1] The later name, found only in the Chronicles, is כַּרְמִיל (from the Persian *kirm*, *kirim*), Rom. *carmin*, *carminio*; see my essay on red dye-stuffs

the term correctly; but Luther, in order to give it a more popular turn, has "rose-colour;" the red of the rose, indeed, represents all the shades of red from a pale red to a dull and almost dark red to a fiery red, but the rose is unsuitable in the present passage. The representation of the work of grace, which God promises, as a change from red to white, is founded on the symbolism of colours, quite as much as when, in the Apocalypse, the garments of the saints are said to be of a bright white (xix. 8), while the clothing of Babylon is purple and scarlet (xvii. 4). Red, and this of a scarlet hue (*i.e.* bright red, or yellowish red), is the colour of fire, of anger, and therefore also of sin: white is the colour of light, of grace, of righteousness and holiness. White and scarlet are correlated as light and fire. Fiery red is the colour of sin, as the selfish, greedy, passionate life, which goes out of itself in order to destroy: sin is called red, inasmuch as its nature consumes and destroys the man in whom it dwells, and when it breaks forth, also consumes other men. According to the Biblical view, sin and piety, anger and love or grace are mutually related as fire and light, hence as red and white, or also as black and white; for red is the colour of the fire that shines up out of the darkness and returns into it, while white, without any mixture of darkness, sets forth the pure, absolute triumph of light. What we read here in Isaiah is a deeply significant symbolical representation of the act of justification. Jehovah offers Himself to Israel for the performance of a forensic act, out of which, though the people have merited death on account of their sins, they are to go forth justified by grace. The righteousness, white as snow and wool, with which Israel goes forth, is a gift which, without being conditioned by the performance of a legal requirement, becomes theirs through pure compassion displayed towards them.

But after Israel has been completely restored to its former state through such an act of grace, the conduct of the people, of course, comes into consideration, not, however (as Cheyne thinks), as the condition on the fulfilment of which the pro-

in the *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morg. Gesellschaft*, xvii. 676 ff., and the article "Colours in the Bible" in Herzog's *Cyclopaedia* (English translation, edited by Schaff, vol. i. p. 514 f.), also my "Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers" (English translation, Edinburgh 1889).

mised change would take place, but as prospectively, its morally certain and necessary result. According as Israel accepts the proffered grace of God and afterwards acts in accordance therewith, Jehovah decides the future of Israel, vers. 19, 20: "*If ye will consent and hear, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye will refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword, for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it.*" If they assent to the act of grace which God offers them, and accept this discharge from the guilt of sin, then certainly there again lies before the justified once more a blessing and a curse, in the same way as the law had already announced both (in connection with ver. 19*b*, compare Deut. xxviii. 33 f.; Lev. xxvi. 3 ff.; and on the threat of the avenging sword in 20*b*, see Lev. xxvi. 25). The promise speaks of eating, viz. the enjoyment of abundant domestic blessings, and thus points to settled and peaceful home-life; for here the subject of the purification from sin is not (as in Ps. li.) a person, but the nation. The opposite of this is the curse,—not of eating the sword (cf. Arab. *at'ama es-séfa*, to give any one the sword to eat, *i.e.* to kill him), as Aug. Müller (*Hebr. Syntax*, Eng. transl. § 47, Rem. *a*) thinks, rendering, "ye shall be made to devour the sword,"—but (as אֻכַּל elsewhere also is a simple passive, not a causative passive of the Qal), as shown in Gesen. § 121. 3, "ye shall be devoured by the sword." חֶרֶב is the accusative of manner, in the sense of the means (instrumental accusative), as in Ps. xvii. 13, 14; standing in this way, without genitive or adjective or suffix (as also, *e.g.*, in Ex. xxx. 20), this adverbial accusative is rare, and in this passage is a bold construction which the prophet allows himself to make for the sake of the paronomasia, instead of saying חֶרֶב תֹּאכַלְכֶם. In the conditional clauses, the two imperfects are followed by two perfects (cf. the mode of expression in Lev. xxvi. 21, which is more consonant with our Western usage), inasmuch as obeying and rebelling equally result from an act of the will: "if ye will consent, and, in consequence of this, hear . . . if ye will refuse, and show yourselves obstinate:" we have thus here true "consecutive perfects." אָבָה, which is elsewhere used fifty-two times with לֹא, or in a negative question (Job xxxix. 9), is used only here in a positive meaning,—perhaps to chime with טוֹב; like תְּאֻכְלוּ with תֹּאכַל.

The second half of the address begins with ver. 21, and like the first it opens with the lamentation of God over the apostasy of His people. To the Piska after ver. 20 corresponds a long pause in the mind of the speaker. Will Israel tread the saving path of forgiveness of sins, now offered them, and enter on a life of new obedience, and will it thus be possible for them to be brought back by this way? Some may perhaps return, but not all; hence the divine address becomes a mournful complaint. So peaceful a solution of the discord between Jehovah and His children is not to be hoped for; Jerusalem is far too deeply depraved. "*How is she become a harlot, the faithful citadel,—she that was full of judgment, and wherein righteousness used to lodge,—but now murderers!*" The keynote here sounded is that of an elegy. אֵיכָה (properly, "how thus?"—for אֵי gives an interrogative sense to demonstrative words), only seldom in the shortened form אֵיךְ, is an expression indicative at once of complaint and astonishment. This longer form, more like a sigh, is a word characteristic of the קִינָה or lamentation; thus, while the Lamentations of Jeremiah begin with אֵיכָה, and receive their usual designation (in Hebrew) from this word,—on the other hand, the shorter אֵיךְ, used in mocking complaints, is a word characteristic of the מָשָׁל or proverb, see xiv. 4, 12; Micah ii. 4. From this word, which gives the keynote, everything runs on softly, fully, evenly, and slowly, in the manner peculiar to an elegy. That such forms, moreover, as מְלֵאתִי for מָלְאָה (on the so-called "Hirek compaginis," see the introduction to Ps. cxvi.), softened through lengthening, are adapted for elegiac productions, is at once evident from the first verse of the Lamentations, which begin with the elegiac keynote struck by Isaiah. Jerusalem was formerly קִרְיָה נֶאֱמָנָה, a faithful city, *i.e.* one that stedfastly adhered to the alliance of Jehovah with her (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 37). This alliance was a marriage-alliance; but she has broken it and has thereby become a זוֹנָה, "harlot,"—a prophetic view, the outlines of which have already been given in the Pentateuch, Israel's worship of idols being there called a whoring after them, *e.g.* in the law of the two tables, Ex. xxxiv. 16; Num. xiv. 33, etc. (in all, seven passages); cf. Ps. xvi. 4, lxxiii. 27. It is not merely gross outward idolatry, however,

that makes the Church of God a "harlot," but the defection of the heart, however this may at any time express itself; for which reason Jesus also could call the generation of His time γενεὰ μοιχαλίς, in spite of the strict worship of Jehovah carried on in Pharisaic spirit. For, as shown by the verse before us, the basis of that marriage-relation was justice and righteousness in the widest sense: מִשְׁפָּט, *i.e.* a realization of righteousness corresponding to the will of God as positively made known; and צֶדֶק, *i.e.* a righteous state of things regulated by that will, a righteous line of conduct in accordance with it (different from the more attributive צְדָקָה). Jerusalem was formerly full of such justice; and righteousness was not merely like a passing guest in the city, but she who came down from above had there fixed her permanent abode; there she used to tarry day and night, as if it were her home. When the prophet refers to former days, he has in his mind the times of David and Solomon, but especially those of Jehoshaphat, who (about one hundred and fifty years before Isaiah appeared) restored the administration of justice which had fallen into neglect since the latter years of Solomon and the days of Rehoboam and Abijah,—a point to which the reformation of Asa had not extended,—and who reorganized all in the spirit of the law. Those institutions of Jehoshaphat which fell into decay under his three godless successors may possibly have been re-established by the high priest Jehoiada under the rule of Joash; but even in the second half of the reign of Joash the administration of justice had already fallen once more into the fearful disorder in which—compared at least with the times of David and Solomon, and afterwards of Jehoshaphat—it still remained even in Isaiah's days. The whole point and weight of the complaint concentrate upon וְעַתָּה, "but now," which expresses the contrast. In correct codices and editions (*e.g.* Brescia 1494) מִשְׁפָּט has not *Zakeph*, but *Rebia*; and בָּהּ, which ought to have *Zakeph*, has *Tiphcha*, on account of the shortness of the succeeding clause. In this way the declaration regarding the former state of things is duly distinguished from that concerning the present. Formerly righteousness, now מְרַצְּחִים, "murderers," and that too (as distinguished from רֹצְחִים) by profession, who form a band, like King Ahab and his son Joram, 2 Kings vi. 32.

The contrast is as great as it could possibly be; for murder is the extreme opposite of righteousness, its grossest violation.

From the city generally, the complaint now turns to the rulers, and first of all is couched in figurative language, ver. 22: "*Thy silver has become dross, thy drink adulterated with water.*" This passage is the basis of other two in which like figurative language abounds, Jer. vi. 27 ff.; Ezek. xxii. 18–22. The silver represents the princes and lords, viewed with reference to the nobility of mind associated with their nobility of birth and rank; for silver—sterling silver—is a symbol of all that is noble and pure, and it is the purity of light which shows itself in it, as in the pure white of byssus and of the lily. The princes and lords formerly possessed the virtues which together are in Latin called *candor animi*,—the virtues of magnanimity, courtesy, impartiality, and freedom from the influence of bribes; now, this silver has become dross, such base metals as are separated or thrown aside (סִיג, pl. סִיגִים, סְגִים, סְגִנִים, from סוּג, to withdraw; refuse removed in smelting, dross; cf. Prov. xxv. 4, xxvi. 23). In a second figure, the leading men of Jerusalem in former days are compared to סֹבֵא, "choice wine," such as drinkers like,—for this must have been the meaning of the word (from סָבָא, to carouse, Arab. سباء, to purchase wine for a carousal) in Isaiah's time (cf. also Nah. i. 10) among educated circles. This pure, strong, and costly wine is now adulterated with water (*castratum*, according to Pliny's expression in his *Natural History;* cf. *jugulare Falernum*, in Martial, i. 18), or weakened; *i.e.* through this addition, its strength and flavour are diminished. The present is but the dregs and the shadow of the past.

In ver. 23 the prophet explains himself; he repeats in plain language what has been already stated under a figure: "*Thy rulers are rebellious, and associates of thieves; every one loves a bribe, and hunts after payments; the orphan they judge not, and the cause of the widow has no access to them.*" The utter and contemptible meanness of the rulers (שָׂרִים) of the people is here depicted by the alliterating סוֹרְרִים in relation to God, "rebellious, stubborn," and by חַבְרֵי גַנָּבִים in relation to men, "associates of thieves," in that they allow themselves to be bought over, by a present of part of the plunder, to connive at the theft, and to deal unjustly towards those who

were robbed. Such bribes are not merely willingly (אֹהֵב) accepted by them,—and that, too, by the whole body of the princes, *i.e.* every single one of them (כֻּלּוֹ with neuter suffix, synon. הַכֹּל, all),—but they even greedily go after them (רֹדֵף). It is not שָׁלוֹם ("peace") they hunt after (Ps. xxxiv. 15), but שַׁלְמֹנִים ("payments," recompense for their trouble; cf. שִׁלֻּם, Micah vii. 3); and thus not peace, but something to satisfy their avarice and partiality.

Such is the case of Jerusalem, which will hardly enter on the path of grace opened up to it in ver. 18; Jehovah will therefore employ another means of correction (ver. 24): "*Therefore, declaration of Jehovah, of Jehovah of Hosts, of the Strong One of Israel, Ah! I shall enjoy myself on mine adversaries, and will avenge myself on mine enemies.*" Salvation through judgment is still and ever the only means of improving and preserving the congregation that takes its name from Jerusalem. Therefore Jehovah seeks to satisfy the demands of His holiness, and to sift Jerusalem through judicial dealing. Such an accumulation of divine names as occurs here is nowhere else found in Isaiah; cf. xix. 4, iii. 1, x. 33, xvi. 3, 15. The irrevocable decree concerning the sifting judgment is sealed with three names which indicate the irresistible omnipotence of God. The title אֲבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the Mighty One of Israel," is derived from Gen. xlix. 24, though the name of the nation is changed. In accordance with the deep and earnest pathos of the address, instead of אָמַר there is here used נְאֻם, from נָאַם, for which the form in the Mishna is נוּם; cognate is נָהַם, Arab. ناٰم, to speak softly, groan; נמם, to whisper quietly. All these verbs indicate the emission of a dull and hollow groan; hence נְאוּם means that which is spoken significantly and secretly, solemnly and softly. The word occurs only in genitival connection with a following subject indicating the person who speaks, particularly in the expression נְאֻם יְהוָה; it always forms a noun-clause ("declaration of Jehovah," *i.e.* Jehovah speaks). It is first found in Gen. xxii. 16; in the writings of the prophets, it is found even so early as in Obadiah and Joel, most frequently in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, usually at the end of a sentence, or parenthetically in the middle of it,—rarely, as here and in

lvi. 8 (see our commentary on Ps. cx. 1), at the beginning. The utterance commences with הוֹי, the painfulness of pity commingling with the outburst of wrath that has been determined. Along with the Niphal נִקָּם כִּן ("to avenge one's self on") there stands the allied Niphal נִחַם (properly, "to console one's self"), the latter with *ĕ*, the former (in accordance with the so-called Assyrian system of pointing) with *i* under the preformative, which is sometimes found elsewhere also, *e.g.* in Gen. xvi. 2, xxi. 24; Num. xxiii. 15; Ezek. xx. 36; 1 Sam. xii. 7. Jehovah is going to relieve Himself of His enemies by letting out on them the wrath that had hitherto burdened Him (Ezek. v. 13): thus does He now call the mass of the people in Jerusalem by their right name.

Ver. 25 declares wherein consists the revenge to which Jehovah has been inwardly constrained: "*And I will bring mine hand upon thee, and will smelt out thy dross as with alkali; and I will remove all thy pieces of lead.*" As long as God leaves any man's actions or sufferings alone, His hand is said to rest. הֵשִׁיב יָד followed by עַל signifies the turning of the hand which has hitherto been at rest, either for punishing (Amos i. 8; Jer. vi. 9; Ezek. xxxviii. 12; Ps. lxxxi. 15), or even, though but seldom, for saving (Zech. xiii. 17) the person mentioned. Here the reference is to dealing towards Jerusalem, in which punishment and salvation are combined—the punishment as the means, salvation as the end. Jehovah's intervention is compared to a smelting which will sweep away, not Jerusalem, but the ungodly who dwell there. These are compared to dross or drossy ore, and—inasmuch as lead is removed in all refinement of silver—to those commingled pieces of lead which Jehovah will speedily and thoroughly separate כַּבֹּר, "like the alkali,"—the abbreviated mode of comparison, instead of כְּבֹר, "as with the alkali." בְּדִילִים (from בָּדַל, to separate) are the pieces of tin or lead (lead-glance)[1] containing the silver, which, inasmuch as

[1] Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 24. 16) says that *plumbum nigrum* sometimes occurs alone, sometimes combined with silver: *ejus qui primus fluit in fornacibus liquor stannum appellatur.* What is here meant is the litharge which, in the process of obtaining silver from the lead-glance containing the precious metal, separates itself till it comes to be the so-called silver-glance. This dross, in the form of powder, is called בְּדִיל, and the pieces

all the baser metals are distinguished from the precious ones by the fact that they are combustible (oxidisable), are separated by smelting. Both בֹּר, *i.c.* potash (an alkali obtained from the ashes of wood and of land-plants generally), and נֶתֶר, *i.c.* natron or soda (which is either mineral, or obtained from plants), which dissolves in water (see on Prov. xxv. 20), were employed from the earliest times, when one wished to extract a metal from its ore, as a means of accelerating the process of smelting. The conjecture of a different reading, בכר (בַּכּוּר, "in the crucible"), is thus superfluous.

As the threat against Jerusalem, put in this allegorical form, does not refer to destruction, but to smelting, there is nothing strange in the fact that in ver. 26 it changes into pure promise, the meltingly soft, ardently mournful conclusion of the clauses in יְיָ, which is the keynote of the later songs of Zion, being continued: "*And I will restore thy judges as in the olden time, and thy counsellors as in the beginning; afterwards thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, a faithful citadel.*" Even the threatening itself was relatively a promise, in so far as what could stand the fire in Jerusalem would survive the judgment, the specific object of which was to bring back Jerusalem to the precious metal of its true nature. But after this has been accomplished, still more than this shall also come to pass. The imperishable kernel that remains becomes the centre to which all elements of excellence are attracted,—Jerusalem again receiving from Jehovah its judges and counsellors, whom, from the time that it became the city of David and the seat of the temple, it had possessed in the best days of the kingdom,—not, indeed, the same persons, but men of like excellence. The two time-limitations have the force of accusatives attached to the predicate: "as in the beginning," *i.e.* of the same character as they were before. הָרִאשֹׁנָה signifies, in a neuter sense, what is

בְּדִילִים; on the other hand, עֹפֶרֶת is the name of the solid lead which is obtained by melting down lead-glance which does not contain silver. But that בְּדִיל signifies lead (*plumbum nigrum*), Zech. iv. 10, as well as tin (*plumbum album*), Num. xxxi. 22, is accounted for in the same way as the homonymy of iron and basalt, oak and terebinth: the two metals are called by the same name on account of external resemblance and common properties,—softness, flexibility, colour, and specific gravity.

temporally or locally (lx. 9) the first; and the fact that, in בְּבָרִאשֹׁנָה, a second preposition follows בְּ, is not without example elsewhere, as Gen. xxxviii. 24; Lev. xxvi. 37; 1 Sam. xiv. 14 (also x. 27, if we read בְּמַחֲדֵשׁ, which is suggested by the LXX.); cf. also בְּעַל, Ps. cxix. 14; Isa. lix. 18, lxiii. 7 Under such divinely commissioned leaders, Jerusalem will then become what it had been, and will be what it ought to be; and the names by which the city is called are the expression of the effect produced on the minds of others through the manifestation of its true nature and character (cf. Zech. viii. 3). With Isaiah the giving of a name is the perception and recognition of the real existence of what has come into outward manifestation. The second designation applied to Jerusalem is without the article: this term קִרְיָה, of such weighty and definite purport, is never used in Isaiah with the article, and, indeed, never occurs with it anywhere except in 1 Kings i. 41, 45.

Jehovah has thus announced the course irrevocably fixed, and leading to salvation, which He will pursue with Israel: this is the leading principle of God's dealings henceforth, the law of Israel's history. Its purport, briefly and tersely put, is thus expressed in ver. 27: "*Sion will be redeemed through judgment, and her returning ones through righteousness.*" מִשְׁפָּט and צְדָקָה are in other places called divine gifts (xxxiii. 5, xxviii. 6), lines of conduct on the part of men that are well-pleasing to God (i. 21, xxxii. 16), royal and Messianic virtues (ix. 6, vi. 3–5, xvi. 5, xxxii. 1). Here, however, the idea is not this peculiarly human one (as Cheyne thinks), but, as shown by parallel passages like iv. 4, v. 16, xxviii. 17, it is to be referred to Jehovah, and the words are to be regarded as meaning God's justice and righteousness in their primarily judicial self-fulfilment. A judgment of God the Righteous One will be the means through which Zion,—so far as it has remained faithful to Jehovah,—and those who in the midst of the judgment return (שָׁבֶיהָ, instead of which Luther read שִׁבְיָהּ), will be redeemed. This judgment will fall upon sinners and sin, and will be the means of breaking that power which has restrained and impeded the nature and workings of Zion, as these were designed of God; it will further be the medium through which those who turn to Jehovah are incorporated

into His true Church. When God therefore reveals Himself in His punitive righteousness, He is working out a righteousness which is bestowed as a gift of grace on those who escape the former. The idea of "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη) is here, as in Hos. ii. 21, on New Testament lines. In front, there is the fire of the law; behind, there is the light of the gospel. Behind the wrath is hidden love, as the ultimate motive-power, like the sun behind the thunder-clouds. Zion, as far as it is truly Zion and is becoming Zion, is redeemed; only the ungodly are destroyed, but these without mercy, as is added in ver. 28: "*But the destruction of the transgressors and sinners* [*shall be*] *together, and those who forsake Jehovah shall perish.*" In this way even the judicial aspect of the approaching act of redemption is expressed in a manner that can be understood by every one. The impassioned exclamatory clause in the first half of the verse is explained by the declamatory verb-clause of the second. פֹּשְׁעִים are those who in heart and in outward conduct have broken away from Jehovah; חַטָּאִים are those who spend their lives in open and prevailing sins; עֹזְבֵי יְהוָה are those who have become estranged from God in one or other of these ways.

Ver. 29, beginning with an explanatory כִּי, declares how God's judgment of destruction falls upon all these: "*For they shall be ashamed of the terebinths in which ye delighted, and ye must blush because of the gardens in which ye had pleasure.*" The terebinths and gardens (this second word with the article, as in Hab. iii. 8 first בנהרים, then בַּנְּהָרִים) are not referred to as objects of luxury (as Hitzig and Drechsler suppose), but as unlawful places of worship (see Deut. xvi. 21) and objects of worship: both of them are frequently mentioned by the prophets with this meaning, lvii. 5, lxv. 3, lxvi. 17. חָמַר and בָּחַר are the usual verbs employed in speaking of Gentile will-worship (ἐθελοθρησκεία), as in xliv. 9, xli. 24, lxvi. 3; and בּוֹשׁ מִן is the customary phrase for indicating the shame that comes over idolaters when the helplessness of their idols proves that they are nothing. Regarding בּוֹשׁ (to be disturbed, lose self-command) and חָפֵר (to be covered over, become covered with shame), see our commentary on Ps. xxxiv. 6, xxxv. 4; cf. Wünsche on *Hosea*, i. p. 54. The LXX. and other ancient versions incorrectly render אֵילִים by εἴδωλα, though the feeling

by which they were prompted is correct: the places of worship here (cf. Jer. xlviii. 13) stand for the idols (אֵלִים, for which the form אֵילִים is never written when *Dii* is the meaning). The abrupt transition from plain statement to direct address shows how excited the prophet is here at the close of the discourse.

In this animated strain he continues; and, led by the association of ideas, he makes terebinths and gardens the future figures of the idolaters themselves. Ver. 30: "*For ye shall be like a terebinth with withered leaves, and like a garden in which there is no water.*" Their prosperity is being destroyed, and they are thus like a terebinth נֹבֶלֶת עָלֶהָ. This last expression does not mean "withered its foliage," *i.e.* whose foliage is withered (for עָלֶה is masc.), but "which is withered in its foliage"[1] (genitival construction, as in xxx. 27; see Ewald's *Syntax*, § 288*c*); their sources of help are dried up, and thus they resemble a garden that has no water, and is therefore waste. The terebinth (turpentine-pistacia), a native of southern and eastern Palestine, casts its leaves (which are small, and resemble those of the walnut-tree) in the autumn. In this dry and parched condition, terebinth and garden, to which the idolaters are compared, are readily inflammable. There is but needed a spark to kindle, and then they are consumed in the flames.

Ver. 31, in a third figure, shows the quarter from which this kindling spark will come: "*And the wealthy one becomes tow, and his work a spark; and both shall burn together, and no one extinguishes them.*" The form פֹּעֲלוֹ primarily suggests a participial meaning, "he who prepares it;" but הֶחָסוֹן would be an unusual epithet to apply to the idol. Besides, the figure, on this view, becomes distorted, for certainly the natural order is that the idol is what kindles or inflames, while man is the object to be kindled,—not the converse. Hence פֹּעֲלוֹ here means "his work" (as in the LXX., Targum,

[1] The noun עָלֶה is a collective, and not till we come to Nehemiah do we find the plur. עָלִים, just as it is not till we reach the post-Biblical Hebrew that a plur. פֵּרוֹת is formed from the collective פֶּרִי. We might have expected עָלָה instead of עָלֶה,—like שָׂדָה in 2 Kings viii. 3; but such nouns from verbs לה are mostly combined with the suffixes *ēhu*, *éha* (*e.g.* מַרְאֵהוּ for מַרְאֵה, Lev. xiii. 4, xx. 25), the termination *ă*=*aj* having an influence on the choice of the suffix-form (Gesen. § 91, note 1*b*).

and Vulgate): the forms פָּעֳלוֹ and פֹּעֳלוֹ (cf. lii. 14; Jer. xxii. 13) are two equally possible modifications of the fundamental form פָּעֳלוֹ (פָּעְלוֹ). As ver. 29 referred to the worship of idols, פֹּעַל does not here mean work in the general ethical sense (as Gesenius thinks, *Thes.*), but the idol, as something made (cf. ii. 8, xxxvii. 19, etc.). The wealthy idolater, who out of the abundance of his possessions (חֹסֶן, xxxiii. 6) could afford gold and silver for making idols, will become tow (Talm. נערת שׁל פּשׁתן, "refuse of flax," from נער, to shake out, viz. in the swingling and combing; and, on the other hand, חֹסֶן is the Talmudic word for flax that is still uncombed and undressed), and the idol will be the spark that sets this mass of fibres on fire, so that both will burn without any possibility of being saved (regarding בָּעַר, see the remarks on iv. 4).[1] For the fire of judgment that consumes sinners does not need to come from without: sin carries within itself the fire of wrath. But the idol is the *corpus delicti*,—the sin of the idolater, as it were, set forth and embodied in visible form.

The time when this first prophetic discourse was composed is a difficult problem. Caspari, in his *Contributions*, has thoroughly examined all possible dates, and has finally decided in favour of the view that it belongs to the time of Uzziah, on the ground that vers. 7–9 do not relate to an actual, but merely to an ideal present. But this view is, and must continue to be, arbitrary. Every unprejudiced reader will receive from vers. 7–9 the impression that what is there depicted is something actually present. Moreover, during the period of Isaiah's ministry the land of Judah was actually laid waste on two occasions, on both of which Jerusalem was spared only through the miraculous protection of Jehovah,—once during the reign of Ahaz, in the year of the Syro-Ephraimitish war; and the second time during Hezekiah's reign, when the Assyrian host laid waste the country, only to be finally dashed to pieces at Jerusalem. Gesenius, Maurer, Movers, Knobel, Driver, and

[1] This חסן is an old Hebrew word preserved in the Mishna (*Shabbath* ii. 1). Rabbi Joseph there explains it, with reference to the present passage, כיתנא דדייק ולא נפיץ, flax which has been broken, but not yet combed; and it seems to be assumed there that Isaiah, when he calls the idolater החסון, alludes to חֹסֶן: "As the נעורת proceeds from the חוסן, so will the idolatrous חסון become נעורת."—(Dr. H. Ehrentreu.)

others decide in favour of the year when the Syro-Ephraimitish war took place; while Hitzig, Umbreit, Drechsler, Luzzatto, and Küper hold that the time was that of the Assyrian oppression. Whichever view we may take, there ever remains, as the test of its admissibility, the difficult question, How has this prophecy come to stand at the beginning of the book, if it belongs to the times of Uzziah and Jotham? This question we shall endeavour to answer when we reach chap. vi.

The path of General Judgment, showing the course of Israel from False to True Glory, Chaps. II.–IV.

The limits of this discourse cannot be mistaken. From the beginning of chap. ii. to the end of chap. iv. a complete circle is formed. After frequent changes between exhortation, reproach, and threatening, the prophet reaches the object of the promise with which he began. On the other hand, chap. v. commences with a wholly new subject, forming an independent discourse, though connected with that which precedes by the superscription in ii. 1: "*The word which Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.*" Chaps. ii.–v. may possibly have already existed under this heading before the whole collection was formed: this superscription was then taken over into the entire work, in order to call attention to the transition from the prologue to the body of the book. What the prophet utters concerning Judah and Jerusalem he calls "the word which he saw." When men speak one to another, the words are not seen, but heard; but when God speaks with the prophet, this is done in a supersensuous manner, and the prophet sees it in this way,—for though the spirit of man has neither eyes nor ears, yet when enabled to perceive the supersensuous, it is altogether eye.

The way in which Isaiah begins this second discourse is without a parallel; there is no other prophetic address whatever that commences with וְהָיָה (for Ezek. xxxviii. 10 is not a beginning, but a continuation). It is easy to tell the reason, however. This "consecutive preterite" receives the meaning of a future only from the context; whereas וַיְהִי (with which historical books and sections very commonly begin) shows its character by its very form. It is further to be noted that the copu-

lative meaning of the ו in the "consecutive imperfect" retains less of its living force than in the "consecutive perfect." The prophet accordingly begins with "and;" and that היה is meant to bear a future sense is to be made out, not from what precedes, but from what follows. This, however, is not the only strange thing here; for there is, further, no other case in which a prophetic address—especially one like this, which runs through all the phases of prophetic discourse (exhortation, reproof, threatening, promise)—begins with a promise. We are in a condition, however, to see clearly the reason of this remarkable phenomenon; for vers. 2–4 are not at all the words of Isaiah himself, but the words of another, taken out of their connection. "Every one of the prophets," says the *Pesikta de-Rab Cahana* 125*b*, "follows the precedent set him by those who have gone before (נביא מפי נביא); but thou, O Isaiah, dost prophesy under the direct influence of the divine majesty" (מפי הגבורה). This is a grand testimony to the originality of Isaiah, yet it does not exclude his falling back on his predecessors. For we also find the words of vers. 2–4, in a slightly different form, in Micah iv. 1–4; and whether Isaiah took the words of this prediction from Micah, or whether both prophets derived them from a common source, in any case they are not Isaiah's originally.[1] Nor was it at all intended that they should

[1] The statement in Jer. xxvi. 18, that Micah uttered the threatening recorded in Micah iii. 12 (the counterpart of which is the promise in Micah iv. 1–4 and Isa. ii. 2–4) during the reign of Hezekiah, seems to militate against the idea that Isaiah borrowed from Micah. Independently of each other, Ewald (*Prophets of the Old Testament*, Eng. trans. vol. ii. pp. 27, 314) and Hitzig (*Commentary on Isaiah and Micah; Studien und Kritiken* for 1829, 2) have conjectured that both Micah and Isaiah repeat what was first uttered by a third and earlier prophet, whom Hitzig further supposes to have been Joel; Cheyne also (1868) thinks this probable. The passage in question has actually many points in common with the Book of Joel, such as the picture given of the reforging of the אתים and מזמרות (iv. 10), the combinations of רב and עצום, of גפן and תאנה (cf. with Micah iv. 4). In Micah, however, it forms the obverse side of the threat of judgment that preceded; ver. 3 also reminds us of Micah's style (see the remarks on that verse); and the statement in Jer. xxvi. 18 is quite compatible with the supposition that Isaiah borrowed these words of promise from Micah (see the closing remarks on chaps. i.–vi.). Cf. Caspari on *Micah*, p. 444 ff.

seem to be his. Isaiah has not fused them into the general current of his own address, as prophets are elsewhere wont to do with the predictions of their predecessors. He does not reproduce them, but, as we are meant to observe, from the abrupt beginning, he quotes them. This certainly does not seem to agree with the heading, according to which the succeeding declarations are the word of Jehovah which Isaiah saw; but there is no real disagreement. It is just the spirit of prophecy which here brings into Isaiah's remembrance a prophetic utterance already recorded, and makes it the starting-point of the series of thoughts which follow. The borrowed promise is not by any means cited for its own sake, but serves merely as a basis for the following exhortation and threat of judgment, through which, after the borrowed introduction, Isaiah's discourse aspires to a conclusion of its own.

The subject-matter of the borrowed words of prophecy is the future glory of Israel. Ver. 2: "*And it comes to pass at the end of the days, the mountain of the house of Jehovah will be established on the top of the mountains, and exalted over hills, and all nations stream unto it.*" The expression "the last days," or "end of the days" (אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים), which does not occur anywhere else in Isaiah, may either, in contrast with the time of commencement, signify the time of the end, or, in contrast with the present, the time that follows (as in Deut. xxxi. 29; Jer. xxiii. 20); according to preponderating usage, however, this expression is applied to the future that forms the close of history. Whether we render it by ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις or (as in 1 Tim. iv. 1) by ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς, the idea it presents is eschatological, but this in relation to the horizon of the speaker. This horizon is very varied; and the history of prophecy is just the history of its gradual extension and completion. In the blessing of Jacob, Gen. xlix., the occupation of the land of Canaan stands in the foreground of the "last days," and regulates the perspective; but here, in Isaiah, "the last days" mean the time of the end in the most simple and literal sense. The prophet predicts that the mountain on which the temple was built will one day visibly tower above all the heights of the earth, and be enthroned like a king over his subjects. At present, the south-eastern hill on which the temple is built is sur-

passed in height by the south-western hill; and the basaltic mountains of Bashan, rising in bold peaks and columns, look down with scorn and contempt on the little limestone-hill which Jehovah has chosen (Ps. lxviii. 16 f.),—a wrong relation which the last times will remove, by making the outward correspond to the inward, the appearance to the reality and intrinsic worth. That such is the prophet's meaning is confirmed by Ezek. xl. 2, where the temple-mount appears gigantic to the prophet, and by Zech. xiv. 10 (parallels, which Cheyne also compares), according to which all Jerusalem will one day, as the actual centre and apex (cf. Ezek. v. 5), tower above the country round about, which shall have become a plain. If this be the meaning of the passage, there still remains doubt regarding the sense attaching to בְּרֹאשׁ. Is it meant that Moriah will come to stand "upon the top" of the mountains surrounding it (בְּרֹאשׁ being rendered as in Ps. lxxxii. 16), or that it will stand "at the head" of them (the expression being used as in 1 Kings xxi. 9, 12; Amos vi. 7; Jer. xxxi. 7)? The former is the view of Hofmann (in his *Weissag. und Erfüllung*, ii. 217): his opinion is, not that the mountains will be piled up, one on the top of the other, with the temple-mount over all (as it is said in *Pesikta de-Rab Cahana* 144*b*, that God will bring together Sinai, Tabor, and Carmel, and erect the temple-building upon the top of them), but that Zion will seem to float on the summit of the other mountains: this is also the explanation given by Ewald. But inasmuch as the expression נָכוֹן, "established," is not favourable to this mode of getting rid of a wonderful phenomenon, and because בְּרֹאשׁ, in the sense of "at the head," occurs still more frequently than with the meaning "on the top," what is meant is the exaltation of Zion by means of lifting, yet this in such a way that the physical and visible elevation is but a means to the dignitative and moral, and easily changes from the literal sense to the ideal. Raised to a position towering over everything besides, the mountain chosen of God becomes the place of meeting and the centre of unity for all nations. It is the temple of Jehovah which now, visible to the nations from afar, exercises such magnetic powers of attraction, and with such results (cf. lvi. 7; Jer. iii. 17; Zech. viii. 20 ff.). Now, it is but a single nation, Israel,

that makes pilgrimages to the temple-mount on great festivals, —then it will be otherwise.

Ver. 3: "*And peoples in multitudes go and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob: let Him instruct us out of His ways, and we will walk in His paths.*" This is their watchword for the starting, this is their song on the way that they go (cf. Zech. viii. 21 f., ii. 15). What urges them is the desire of salvation. Desire for salvation expresses itself in the name they give to the goal of their journey: they call Zion (=Mount Moriah, 2 Chron. iii. 1) the "mountain of Jehovah;" they call the temple built on it "the house of the God of Jacob;" "Israel," as the name of the people of God, has by frequent use become common, so they employ the more refined name "Jacob,"—the name dear to Micah, of whose style (see iv. 11, 13, v. 6 f.) we are further reminded by the expression "many nations." Desire of salvation shows itself in the object of their journey; they wish Jehovah to teach them "out of His ways" (מִדְּרָכָיו) —rich material for instruction with which they would like to be gradually intrusted (מִן is here used in a partitive sense, —"out of the fulness of this material for instruction," cf. xlvii. 13, and the somewhat different מִן in Ps. xciv. 12): "the ways of Jehovah" are those in which He Himself walks and in which He conducts men, the revealed ordinances of His government and His will. Desire of salvation also shows itself in their resolution to set out: they not merely wish to learn, but they have made glad resolve to act in accordance with what they have learned: "so will we walk in His paths," —the cohortative, as frequently is the case (*e.g.* Gen. xxvii. 4), being used as the expression of the subjective purpose, or the subjective inference.

Here end the words of the multitude of the heathen who are going up to Zion; but the prophet, at the end of ver. 3 further adds the reason and motive of this holy pilgrimage of the nations: "*For from Zion will a law go forth, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem.*" Zion[1] was originally the name of the south-eastern hill (not, as is now acknowledged, of the south-western hill which was erroneously considered

[1] On the meaning of the word, see Wetstein in my *Commentary on Genesis*, 4th edition (English translation, Edinburgh 1889).

Zion) on which, at several successive stages of descent, were built the temple, the palace of Solomon, and the city of David;[1] then it came to be specially applied to the height on which the temple stood, and by synecdoche to the whole of Jerusalem, the true centre of which is the sanctuary. The greatest emphasis is laid on the expressions "out of Zion" and "out of Jerusalem," which indicate a feeling of triumph, and remind us of John iv. 22, ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. From Zion-Jerusalem will go forth תּוֹרָה, *i.e.* instruction regarding the questions which man has to ask at God; and "the word of Jehovah" is that by which the world was created and by which it is spiritually transformed. Hence, what makes the nations truly prosperous comes from Zion-Jerusalem. Thither assemble the nations, thence they carry away a blessing with them to their homes, and thus Zion-Jerusalem becomes the source of all-embracing good; for, from the time that Jehovah chose Zion, the sanctity of Sinai (according to Ps. lxviii. 18) was transferred to Zion; and what was begun at Sinai for Israel is completed from Zion for all the world. This was fulfilled at that Feast of Pentecost when the first-fruits of the Church of Christ proclaimed the law of Zion, *i.e.* the gospel, in all the languages of the world. It is fulfilled, as Theodoret here remarks, in the fact that the word of the gospel, beginning at Jerusalem οἷον ἀπό τινος πηγῆς, ran through the whole inhabited world (cf. Luke xxiv. 47, ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ).

All these fulfilments, however, were but preludes to an end still to be expected, and forming their completion. For there is no fulfilment yet of what is predicted in ver. 4: "*And He will judge between the nations, and pronounce judgment to many nations; and they forge their swords into coulters, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation lifts not up the sword against nation, neither do they learn war any more.*" When the nations thus betake themselves as pupils to the God of revelation and to the word He has revealed, He becomes among them the supreme judicial tribunal. When dispute arises, it is no longer decided by force of arms, but by the word of God, to which they all bow with willing

[1] See Klaiber in the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, iii. 201.

submission. רַבִּים, used in this way by itself (without the parallel עַצְמִים, found in Micah iv. 3), signifies "many," not "great." When this power of the peace-producing word of God is in active exercise (Zech. ix. 10), there is no longer need for iron weapons: these are re-forged into tools for works of peace,—into אִתִּים (instead of which we find אִתִּים in 1 Sam. xiii. 21, from אָתַת, to break), "coulters" which pre-prepare the furrows while the ploughshare turns them up, and into מַזְמֵרוֹת, "pruning-hooks" or "bills," with which the vine is pruned, in order to increase its fruit-bearing power. Neither is there any more need for military exercises, for there is no need in learning what can no longer be applied: it is useless, and men turn from it in disgust. There is peace; yet not an armed peace, but a full, true, and God-sent peace. The true humanity that was overwhelmed and choked by sin now gains the mastery, and the world observes its Sabbath. What is set forth in Ps. xlvi. 9 f., Hos. ii. 20, was seen more fully by Isaiah, Micah, and Zechariah, is a moral postulate laid down in Scripture, the goal of the history of redemption, the predicted counsel of God.

Isaiah comes before his contemporaries with this older prophecy regarding the noble and world-embracing calling of the people of Jehovah; he holds it up to them like a mirror and exclaims (ver. 5): "*O house of Jacob, come! and let us walk in the light of Jehovah!*" This exhortation is formed under the influence of the context from which vers. 2–4 are taken (as may be seen from Micah iv. 5), and of the cited words themselves; Micah prefers יַעֲקֹב to יִשְׂרָאֵל, though the former name is not unusual in Isaiah (see viii. 17, x. 20 f., xxix. 23), and in chaps. xl.–lxvi. comes into prominence. With the words "O house of Jacob" he turns to his own nation, for whom, because Jehovah has shown Himself graciously present among them, so glorious a future is in store; and he calls on them to walk in the light of such a God, unto whom, in the end of the days, all nations shall come in crowds. The summons, "Come, and let us walk," is the echo of the summons, "Come, and let us go up," in ver. 3; and Hitzig quite correctly remarks, "Like Paul in Rom. xi. 14, Isaiah seeks to rouse his fellow-countrymen to a noble jealousy by pointing to the example of the heathen."

"The light of Jehovah" (an expression in which there is a not unintentional reference to וְיוֹרֵנוּ in ver. 3; cf. Prov. vi. 23) is the knowledge of Him that has been revealed. It is now high time to walk in the light of Jehovah, *i.e.* to turn this knowledge to regulate daily life; and the exhortation to this is highly necessary for Israel just now, when the nation, because it did the contrary, had been given over to a perverse mind.

This sad thought, which the prophet is constrained to make the basis of his warning cry, comes from him in ver. 6, in the form of a prayer breathing sighs: "*For Thou hast rejected Thy people, the house of Jacob; because they have been filled from the East, and are sorcerers like the Philistines, and with the children of foreigners they go hand in hand.*" Once more we have twice כִּי, in immediate succession; the first gives the reason for the warning cry, the second introduces the justification of this reason. The address is directed to Jehovah, not to the people. Of early commentators, Saadia and Gecatilia (cf. also Rashi), and among modern writers, J. D. Michaelis, Hitzig, and Luzzatto take the first words to mean, "Thou hast given up thy nationality" (עַמְּךָ being taken for מֵעֲשֹׂה עַמְּךָ). But עַם signifies "people," not "nationality;" and this interpretation would not have been thought of if the sudden introduction of the address to God had not been considered strange. But in ii. 9, ix. 2, etc., the prophecy also assumes the form of a prayer; moreover, the combination of נָטַשׁ with עַם as an object, recalls such passages as Ps. xciv. 14; 1 Sam. xii. 22. Jehovah has cast away His people from Him (*i.e.* rejected them), and left them to themselves (נָטַשׁ); the perfect is not a prophetic one (as Cheyne thinks), but speaks of what has actually occurred, as is shown by the various symptoms pointed out: (1) They are full from the East (מִקֶּדֶם: here מִן indicates the source from which the filling comes, Ezek. xxxii. 6; Jer. li. 34; and see my commentary on Eccles. i. 8), *i.e.* full of Oriental manners and fashions, particularly idolatrous usages. קֶדֶם is the name given to Arabia down to the peninsula of Sinai, together with the Aramean countries adjacent to the Euphrates. Under Uzziah and Jotham, whose dominion extended as far as Elath, the seaport of the Elanitic Gulf, the influence of the south-western

Orient predominated; but under Ahaz and Hezekiah, on account of their relations to Assyria, Syria, and Babylon, that of the north-east was predominant. The conjectural reading מִקֶּדֶם (suggested by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*) or מִקֶּסֶם (supported by Ewald and Böttcher) would remove the name of the extensive region from which Judah's disposition to imitate received its impulse and material; but perhaps Isaiah wrote קסם מקדם ("fully of sorcery from the East"). (2) They are עֹנְנִים (a form which is interchanged with the more complete מְעֹנְנִים, Deut. xviii. 14, etc., from the Poël עִנֵּן, Lev. xix. 26; 2 Kings xxi. 6), not "Tagewähler," as Luther renders it—for the form is opposed to the derivation from עוֹנָה, "time" (see *Sanhedrin* 65*b*; and cf. Rashi on Lev. xix. 26), but those who observe the clouds for signs of the future (a rendering which Aben-Ezra also very properly prefers), or —more in accordance with the meaning of the Poël—those who bring clouds and storms[1] like the Philistines (who were subdued by Uzziah, and afterwards by Hezekiah), among whom

[1] There is no ground for the explanation "concealing" (*i.e.* practising secret arts); for the meaning "to cover" is arbitrarily transferred to the verb ענן from the roots גָּנַן and כָּנַן (see on Ps. lxxx. 16) with which it is said to be allied. But as a denominative from עָנָן ("a cloud," as meeting the eye), עוֹנֵן might mean "he gathered auguries from the clouds." Or—if we take עוֹנֵן as synonymous with עִנֵּן, Gen. ix. 14 (for, in the Targums, עָנַן and מְעַנֵּן interchange with the Hebrew עוֹנֵן and מְעוֹנֵן, apoc. עוֹנֵן)—it means "to cause a storm;" we would then have the rendering "storm-raisers," *tempestarii*, *νεφοδιῶκται*. (On storm-raising through incantations, especially among the Turanian nations by means of the "rain-stone," see Bernstein's edit. of Kirsch's *Syriae Chrestomathy*, p. 111, line 9 ff.; Wüstenfeld's edit. of *Kazwînî*, i. p. 221, line 10 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall's *Geschichte der goldenen Horde in Kiptschak*, pp. 206 f., 435–438.) The derivation of עוֹנֵן from עין in the sense of the Arab. *'âna* (imperf. *ja'înu*),—as it were "to ogle," in modern Greek *ὀμματίζειν*, *oculo maligno petere et fascinare* (see the Journal of the German Oriental Society, xxxi. 539),—though in itself philologically possible, founders on the Targumic עַנֵּן (to practise sorcery), which cannot possibly be traced to עין. From a purely philological standpoint, however, another explanation still remains possible. From the idea of "coming to meet," *'âna* obtains the transitive sense of holding back, preventing, restraining (as it were *contrarier*), especially to rein in the horse with the bridle (*'inân*), in application to sexual relations.

sorcery was practised by incorporated guilds (1 Sam. vi. 2), while a famous oracle of Beel-Zebûb existed at Ekron (2 Kings i. 2). "And with the children of foreigners they make themselves familiar;" such is the rendering we must give this expression, following Gesenius, Knobel, and Nägelsbach: יַסְפִּיק with כַּפַּיִם signifies to clap hands (Job xxvii. 23); the Hiphil is used only here with בְּ in the sense of striking hands with a person. On the other hand, the LXX. and Syriac render the expression in accordance with the idea of abundance or fulness elsewhere presented in ספק (or שׂפק); but whether it be translated "in the children of foreigners they find satisfaction," or "with the children of foreigners they provide themselves abundantly," the rendering is equally opposed to the usage of the language, which nowhere points to this construction with בְּ. But the Hiph. הִסְפִּיק may be compared with the Arab. صفق, IV., to give the hand (as a token of agreement and approval); it is here combined with בְּ after the analogy of פָּגַע בְּ, *foedus pangere cum aliquo*. Jerome, following Symmachus, here translates *pueris alienis adhaeserunt;* but יַלְדֵי נֵכָרִים is equivalent to בְּנֵי נֵכָר (lx. 10, lxi. 5), only with stronger emphasis on the unsanctified birth, the heathenism inherited from their mother's womb. The prophet means to say it is with born heathens that the people of Jehovah make themselves common,—make common cause in the ordinary business of life.

He now goes on, in vers. 7, 8, to describe how, in consequence of this, the land of the people of Jehovah is crammed full of objects of luxury, self-trust, and estrangement from God: "*And their land is filled with silver and gold, and there is no end to their treasures; and their land is filled with horses, and there is no end to their chariots. And their land is filled with idols; to the work of their hands they bow down in worship, to that which their own fingers have made.*" The glory of Solomon's days, which revived under Uzziah's reign of fifty-two years, and was maintained during Jotham's reign of sixteen years, carried within it the curse of the law; for the law regarding the king, in Deut. xvii. 14 ff., forbids both the multiplying of horses and the multiplying of gold and silver. Standing armies and stores of national treasures, like everything that lends support to carnal self-trust, are opposed to the spirit of the theocracy. Nevertheless Judea is immeasur-

ably full of those things which entice to apostasy (קֶדֶם, from קָדַם, according to Abulwalîd and others, like בֶּכָה, חֶגָה; cf. קָצוּ), and not only so, but also of things that openly show it; אֱלִילִים are "idols" (in the Pentateuch only found in Lev. xix. 4, xxvi. 1; in the singular אֱלִיל, "empty, worthless," Assyr. *ulâlu*, from אָלַל, to be weak, decaying, null;[1] not, as Heidenheim thinks, from אֵל, "a false god;" nor, as Movers supposes, a diminutive, meaning a little god, a small image of a god). The condition of the country is thus at variance not merely with the law regarding the king, but also with the decalogue. The existing splendour is the most offensive caricature of what had been promised; for the nation whose God will one day become the desire and salvation of all nations had exchanged Him for the idols of the nations, and vied with them in the appropriation of heathen religion and practice.

This was a condition of affairs ripe for judgment, and from which the prophet can at once proceed to the proclamation of the judgment, ver. 9: "*Thus, then, men are bowed down, and masters brought low; and forgive them—nay, this thou shalt not!*" The moods of the verbs mark the judgment as one that arises through an inward necessity from the worldly and ungodly glory of the present; this use of the verb-forms frequently occurs, as in ix. 7 ff. It is a judgment through which small and great, *i.e.* people of all classes, are brought down from their false eminence. וַיִּשַּׁח, as in xxix. 4 (cf. Eccles. xii. 4), might be the imperfect Niphal (cf. יִפֹּל, יִגֹּל, יִמֹּל), and Gesenius regards it as such; it is probably, however, the intransitive imperfect Qal (Stade, § 490*a*), for יִשְׁחַח, יִטְהַר, שָׁחַח hardly ever have formed a Niphal; the Qal in itself signifies to be bowed down, depressed, as שָׁפַל signifies to be humble and to be humbled. אָדָם and אִישׁ are not mere interchangeable terms, without any essential difference (as Nägelsbach thinks), but differ as in v. 15; Ps. xlix. 3 (cf. iv. 3; Isa. liii. 3); Prov. viii. 4, and as in Attic Greek *ἄνθρωπος* differs from *ἀνήρ*,—ordinary human beings who disappear in the crowd, and men who rise out of it,[2]—all (Rev. vi. 15) are

[1] See Friedrich Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 133.

[2] In the Arabic of Syria, אדם is strangely used in the latter sense; "people of importance" are called *awâdim*, or *nâs awâdim* (Journal of the German Oriental Society, xxii. 154).

thrown down to the ground by the judgment, and that without mercy. The prophet expresses the conviction (אַל being used as in 2 Kings vi. 27) that God can and will no longer take away their sin (this noun being the object we must regard as following the verb תִּשָּׂא, Ps. xxxii. 1; נשׂא is applied to God, and signifies to forgive, as in Hos. i. 6).

No other course is now left open for them but to follow the sarcastic command of the prophet in ver. 10: "*Creep into the rock, and bury thyself in the dust, before the dread look of Jehovah, and before the glory of His majesty!*" The forms בּוֹא and הִטָּמֵן are imperatives; the inf. constr. of the Niphal is sometimes indeed used instead of the infin. absolute (Num. xv. 31; 1 Kings xv. 39), but there is no instance of the latter form being employed as an imperative. The nation that was supposed to be a glorious one shall and must creep away and hide itself ignominiously, when the glory of God which it had rejected, but which alone is true glory, is judicially manifested. It must conceal itself in holes of the rocks as if from a host of foes (Judg. vi. 2; 1 Sam. xiii. 6, xiv. 11), and bury themselves with their faces in the sand, as from the deadly simoom of the desert, that they may but avoid the necessity of enduring this intolerable sight. When Jehovah reveals Himself thus in the fiery glance of judgment, there follows the result summed up in ver. 11: "*The haughty looks of the people are brought low, and the pride of the lords is bowed down, and Jehovah, He alone, stands exalted in that day.*" The result of the judicial process is expressed in perfects; נִשְׂגָּב is the 3rd pers. of the preterite, not the participle: "Jehovah is exalted," *i.e.* shows Himself exalted; while the haughty demeanour of the people is abased (שָׁפֵל is a verb, not an adjective, in agreement, by attraction, with the genitive, instead of its governing word; see also 2 Sam. i. 21; Lev. xiii. 9; Ps. cxl. 10, *Kethîb;* Dan. iii. 19, *Kethîb*), and the pride of the lords is bowed down (שַׁח = שָׁחַח, Job ix. 13). Here ends the first strophe of the proclamation of judgment, appended to the borrowed prophetic passage in vers. 2–4. The second strophe extends as far as ver. 17, where ver. 11 is repeated as the conclusion.

Looking at the expression, "on that day," we ask ourselves, what kind of day is this? To this question the prophet

replies in the second strophe, first of all in ver. 12: "*For Jehovah of Hosts has a day over everything, towering and high, and over everything lofty, and it becomes low.*" יוֹם לַיהוָה, "Jehovah has a day" (xxii. 5, xxxiv. 8), which even now forms part of what He has freely and independently determined and appointed beforehand (lxiii. 4, xxxvii. 26; cf. xxii. 11), the secret of which he makes known to the prophets, who, from the time of Obadiah and Joel, announce this day, in terms ever the same, like a watchword. But when the time appointed for this day arrives, it passes into the history of time,—a day for the judgment of the world, which, through the omnipotence by which Jehovah rules over the highest as well as the lowest spheres of all creation, passes upon all worldly glory. With כָּל־נִשָּׂא the accent used is *Tiphcha* (Luzzatto, Baer); but certainly *Athnach* would be more suitable, as in Lev. xiii. 18. As the future is spoken of, the perfect וְשָׁפַל acquires the force of a future (*pret. consec.*), "and it shall be brought low (or, sink down)."

The prophet now enumerates all the high things on which this day falls, arranging them together two by two, and combining them in pairs by a double correlative וְ. The day of Jehovah falls, as the first two pairs declare, on everything lofty in nature (vers. 13, 14): "*As upon all cedars of Lebanon, the lofty and exalted, so upon all the oaks of Bashan; as upon all mountains, the lofty ones, so upon all hills, the exalted ones.*" But why upon all this majestic beauty of nature? Has this language a merely figurative meaning? Knobel understands it figuratively, and regards it as referring to the grand buildings of Uzziah and Jotham, for the erection of which like timber had been brought from Lebanon and Bashan, on the western slope of which the old shady oaks (*sindiân* and *ballût*) still continue to grow luxuriantly. But that trees may mean the houses built of them cannot be proved from ix. 9, where the reference is not to houses made of sycamore and cedar wood, but to the trunks of such trees; nor again from Nah. ii. 4, where הַבְּרוֹשִׁים mean the fir lances which are brandished about in eager desire for the fight. As little can mountains and hills mean the castles and fortresses upon them, especially because ver. 15 expressly refers to these, in literal terms. In order to understand the prophet, we must bear in mind what sacred

Scripture assumes throughout, that all nature is joined with man to form one common history; that man and the whole world of nature are inseparably connected as centre and circumference; that this circumference likewise is under the influence of the sin which proceeds from man, as well as under the wrath and the grace which proceed from God to man; that the judgments of God, as proved by the history of nations, bring a share of suffering to the subject creation, and that this participation of the lower creation in the corruption and the glory of man will come into special prominence at the close of this world's history, as it did at the beginning; and lastly, the world in its present form, in order to become an object of the unmixed good pleasure of God, stands as much in need of a regeneration (παλιγγενεσία) as the corporeal part of man himself. In accordance with this fundamental view of the Scriptures, therefore, we cannot wonder that, when the judgment of God goes forth upon Israel, it extends to the land of Israel, and, along with the false glory of the nation, overthrows everything glorious in surrounding nature which had been forced to minister to the national pride and love of display, and to which the national sin adhered in many ways. What the prophet predicts was already actually beginning to be fulfilled in the military inroads of the Assyrians. The cedar forest of Lebanon was being unsparingly shorn: the hills and vales of the country were trodden down and laid waste, and, during the period of the world's history beginning with Tiglath-Pileser, the holy land was being reduced to a shadow of its former predicted beauty.

From what is lofty in nature, transition is now made in vers. 15, 16 to what is exalted in the world of men,—the fortresses, commercial structures, and the works of art that minister to the lust of the eye: "*As upon every high tower, so upon every precipitous wall. As upon all ships of Tarshish, so upon all works of curiosity.*" By erecting lofty and precipitous, *i.e.* difficult of ascent (בָּצוּר), fortifications for defence and offence in war, Uzziah and Jotham particularly desired to render service to Jerusalem and the country generally. The chronicler (2 Chron., chap. xxvi.) states that Uzziah built fortified towers over the corner-gate, the valley-gate, and the southern point of the cheese-makers' ravine, and strengthened

these places (till that time, possibly, the weakest positions in Jerusalem); also that he built towers in the wilderness (perhaps in the wilderness extending from Beersheba to Gaza, for increasing the safety of the country, and its vast flocks that were pastured in the שְׁפֵלָה, *i.e.* the western portion of Southern Palestine). The Books of Kings (2 Kings xv. 32 f.) and Chronicles relate of Jotham that he built the upper gate of the temple; and the Chronicles, moreover, record (2 Chron. xxvii.) that he still further fortified the Ophel, *i.e.* the southern spur of the temple-mount; that he founded cities in the hill-country of Judah, and erected strongholds and towers in the forests (for watching and repelling hostile attacks). Hezekiah also distinguished himself by such building enterprises (2 Chron. xxxii. 27–30). But the mention of ships of Tarshish points to the times of Uzziah and Jotham (as Ps. xlviii. 8 points to the time of Jehoshaphat), for the seaport of Elath, which, according to 2 Kings xiv. 22, was recovered by Uzziah, was once more lost to the kingdom of Judah under Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 6). From this Elath (Ailath), Jewish ships, following in the wake of the Phenicians, used to sail through the Red Sea and round the coast of Africa, landing at the harbour of Tartessus, the ancient Phenician emporium of the maritime district abounding in silver and watered by the Baetis (*i.e.* the Guadalquivir), which was itself also called *Τάρτησσος*: they returned through the Pillars of Hercules (the Straits of Gibraltar, so called after the landing of Ṭarik in 711: Gibraltar = *Gebel-Ṭârik*). The expression אֳנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ was primarily applied to these vessels sailing to Tarshish, then probably to merchant-ships generally.[1] The following expression שְׂכִיּוֹת הַחֶמְדָּה is taken in too restricted a sense if we confine it, with the LXX., to the ships, or, with Gesenius, understand it as meaning beautiful flags. Jerome has correctly rendered the

[1] Jerome, on the verse we are now considering (where the LXX. renders *ἐπὶ πᾶν πλοῖον θαλάσσης*), gives it as a Jewish opinion that תרשיש is the proper Hebrew name for the sea, while ים was originally derived from the Syriac; and in conformity with this, Luther says that the Hebrew has two words for indicating the sea, ים and תרשיש, the latter being used specially to indicate the ocean. Perhaps this view is meant to reconcile 2 Chron. ix. 21, xx. 36 with 1 Kings ix. 26 ff. (Kamphausen in *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 170.)

clause *et super omne quod visu pulchrum est.* שְׂכִיָּה, from שָׂכָה, to see, behold (see my commentaries on Job xxxviii. 36 and Gen. iii. 6), is sight in a quite general sense (*θέα*); while חֶמְדָּה is used here in something of the same way as in Ezek. xxvi. 12, but without the need of understanding it, as in that passage, to mean splendid buildings, with the additional idea of watching, or outlook, in accordance with the Targumic סְכוּת = מצפה (Ewald, Cheyne); the proper place for mentioning these would rather have been after ver. 15, before the ships of Tarshish. What is meant, therefore, is every kind of works of art, made of stone or metal, and painted (מַשְׂכִּית, *θέαμα*, display; cf. Lev. xxvi. 1; Ezek. viii. 12), which delight the beholder by their imposing and tasteful appearance.

Ver. 17 now concludes the second strophe of the announcement of judgment appended to the earlier prophetic passage: "*And the pride of the people is bowed down, and the haughtiness of the lords brought low; and Jehovah, He alone, stands exalted on that day.*" This refrain-verse only slightly differs from ver. 11. The subjects of the verbs in ver. 17*a* have been transposed. It is almost a rule to put the predicate at the beginning of the sentence in the masculine (וְשַׁח, but וְשָׁחָה in Ps. xliv. 26), though the subject following is a feminine noun, when this denotes a thing or things (see Gesenius, § 145. 7, *a*).

The refrain-verse of the two following strophes (in vers. 19–21) is based on the closing portion of ver. 10, and runs out into the concluding words לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ. The announcement of judgment now turns to the idols, which were mentioned before (in vers. 7, 8), but last in order, as the root of evil, among the things with which the land abounds. In a brief verse, consisting of one member and but three words, their future is declared (ver. 18) as if with a swift lightning-flash: "and the idols pass utterly away." The combination of the plural nominative with the verb in the singular is intended to signify that the idols, one and all, are a "mass of nonentity" which will be reduced to annihilation: they will disappear כָּלִיל, *i.e.* either they will utterly perish, or (seeing that כָּלִיל is not elsewhere used adverbially) they will all perish (Judg. xx. 40, a passage which shows that one might

also say וּכְלִיל הָאֱלִילִים),—their images, their worship, even their names and their memory, Zech. xii. 2.

In ver. 19 is declared what the idolaters will do when Jehovah has so thoroughly deprived their idols of all divinity, by rising from His heavenly throne, while His glory revealed in heaven returns to earth and manifests itself as a judicial fire: "*And they will creep into caves of rocks, and into cellars of earth, before the dreadful look of Jehovah, and before the glory of His majesty, when He rises to put the earth in terror.*" מְעָרָה (from עוּר, to go down deep, to be sunk down) is a cave naturally formed, and מְחִלָּה (from חָלַל, to bore through, or bore out) is an artificial excavation underground: in this way, apparently,—to judge from the added genitives,—we must distinguish between the two synonyms. לַעֲרֹץ הָאָרֶץ is a significant paronomasia which admits of being easily rendered in Latin: *ut terreat terram.* The judgment thus falls on the earth without limitation,—on men, its inhabitants, and on all nature, intimately associated with human history, — a whole in which sin, and therefore wrath, has gained the mastery.

The fourth strophe begins with ver. 20: "*On that day will man cast away his idols of gold and idols of silver which they made for him to worship, to the moles and to the bats.*" The traditional text separates לַחְפֹּר פְּרוֹת into two words, without giving us to understand what they are intended to signify.[1] The division was due to the fact that in early times pluriliterals were misunderstood, and regarded as compound words; cf. lxi. 1; Hos. iv. 18; Jer. xlvi. 20. The word as uttered by the prophet was certainly לַחַפַּרְפָּרוֹת (see Ewald, § 157*c*); and חֲפַרְפָּרָה (a form similar to שַׁפְרְפָרָא, the dawn) would appear

[1] Abulwalîd, Parchon, and others regard the double word as the singular of a noun which signifies a bird (perhaps a woodpecker), as an animal that pecks fruits פְּרוֹת). Kimchi prefers to take לַחְפֹּר as an infinitive (cf. Josh. ii. 2), signifying "to dig holes," comparing the Talmudic פִּיר, a pit or hole, a grave. No one renders the expression "into the mouse-hole," because פֶּרֶה, mouse = فَارَة, more exactly فَأْرَة (from *fa'ara*, to dig, dig up), is not a Hebrew word, and was taken from the Arabic only at a late period (hence the Hebraeo-Arabic בּוּרָה, a mouse-trap). The name of the mole in Arabic is فَأْر اعمى, *i.e.* the blind mouse (rat).

to be the mole, and to have received the name as an animal that digs and throws up the soil with its shovel-like forefeet, Lat. *talpa* (as translated by Jerome and explained by Rashi). Against this view, Gesenius and Knobel make the objection that the mole does not live in houses; but it actually burrows underneath the floors of houses, barns, etc., forming its holes beneath them. And are we obliged to think that the shamed idolaters throw their idols into lumber-rooms, instead of rather hiding them outside, thrusting them into holes and crevices? Along with the mole is named "the bat," עֲטַלֵּף (the sound of which is but accidentally similar to *talpa*): this name, since the time of Bochart and Schultens, has been regarded as a compound of עטל = עלטה and עף (cf. *νυκτερίς*, *vespertilio*, Ital. *nottola*, etc.).[1] Moreover, the mole, the shrew-mouse, and the bat are regarded by ancient and modern naturalists as closely related. The bat is among birds what the mole is among smaller predatory animals. Even in the LXX. we find לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת conjoined with these two words: Malbim and Luzzatto likewise make this connection,—as if the idolaters would descend to the most absurd forms of animal-worship. The accentuation, however, which does not make the division of the verse at עִשּׂוּ־לוֹ starts from a correct understanding of the meaning: the idol-worshippers, convinced by God's judicial manifestation that their idols are nonentities, and furious over their unfortunate deception, will throw away with imprecations their gold and silver images which artist hands

[1] The Semitic arrangement of the words would certainly be עף עטל, as the bat is in Arabic called not merely *waṭwâṭ*, but also *ṭêr el-lêl*: the order עף עטל is like that of the Persian name of the bat, شبّر = شب پر (*i.e.* night-flyer), Journal of the Germ. Oriental Soc. xxxii. 241. Fleischer says that "Fürst's ظلف, *occultare*—put in this general way—is a fiction. The probable etymology, as correctly explained in Freytag, is غطل, غطل, applied to the heavens, and night. From this comes غطلس, one in the dark, *tenebrio*, *i.e.* wolf; and this form resembles עֲטַלֵּף, alike in its quinqueliteral form and in its general etymological meaning. See *Bericht der kön. sachs. Ges. der Wiss.* Band i. 1846 and 1847, pp. 430, 431."

made to their order, and thrust them like smuggled goods in bat-holes and mole-heaps to hide them from the eyes of the Judge, that, after casting away the useless burden that would condemn them, they may then betake themselves to flight.

Ver. 21: "*To creep into the hollows of the stone-blocks, and into the clefts of the rocks, before the dreadful look of Jehovah and before the glory of His majesty, when He arises to put the earth in terror.*" Instead of בִּמְעָרוֹת, in ver. 19, there is here found בְּנִקְרוֹת, "into the hollows" (from נָקַר, to dig a hole); and instead of בִּמְחִלּוֹת עָפָר, there is here בְּחָגְוֵי חַפְּלָעִים, "into the crevices of the rocks" (כֶּלַע, a rock, properly a cleft, like *rupes*, from *rumpere*). Thus ends the fourth strophe of this "*dies irae dies illa*," appended to the quotation from the earlier prophet.

Now follows a closing *nota bene* in ver. 22: "*O then, let man go, in whose nose is a breath; for at what is he to be valued?*" The LXX. leaves this verse wholly untranslated: was it not to be found in their copy of the Hebrew? Cheyne regards it as a marginal note, dating from post-exilic times, which breaks the connection; but it is the moralizing conclusion drawn from what precedes, and the basis of the proclamation of judgment (introduced by כִּי) which follows with the opening of the next chapter. Instead of בַּמֶּה, Jerome (like *Beraehoth* 14*a*) read בָּמָה, giving the strange rendering, *exeelsus reputatus est ipse;* and it appears that Luther also allowed himself to be misled by this. If we look both backwards and forwards, we cannot possibly miss the proper meaning of this verse, which must be regarded as not only giving the result of what precedes, but as forming the transition to what follows. What has gone before is the prediction of utter ruin to everything of which men are proud, and of which they boast; and in the beginning of the following chapter the same prediction is resumed, with more special reference to the Jewish state from which Jehovah is taking away every support, so that it is falling into a state of collapse. Accordingly, ver. 22 exhorts to renunciation of trust in man and all that is human, as in Ps. cviii. 8 f., cxlvi. 3; Jer. xvii. 5. The view taken is as general as in a gnome or apothegm. The ethical dative לָכֶם is in this case also the dative of advantage: out of regard for yourselves, for the sake of your own salvation, do cease from

man, *i.e.* from trust in him, in whose nose (*in cujus naso*, as in Job xxvii. 3; on the other hand, in Gen. ii. 7 is found the equivalent בְּאַפָּיו, *in nares ejus*) is a breath, a breath of life, which God has given him, and can take from him again as soon as He pleases (Job xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29). Upon the breath which goes out and in through his nose depends his earthly existence, which, once lost, is gone for ever (Job vii. 7). On this breath, therefore, there also depends all the trust that is placed on man—how weak a foundation! Under these conditions, and in view of this transitoriness, the worth of man as a basis of trust is as nothing. This idea is here expressed in interrogatory form: "At (*or* for) what is he reckoned (*or* to be reckoned)?" The passive partic. נֶחְשָׁב combines with the idea of actuality (*aestimatus*) that of necessity (*aestimandus*) and that of possibility, or what is fit and becoming (*acstimabilis*). The ב is here that of price or value, corresponding to the Latin genitive (*quanti*) or ablative (*quanto*),—a species of the instrumental ב, the price being represented as the means of exchange or purchase: hence the meaning is, "At what is he reckoned?" not, "With what is he compared?"—an idea which would be expressed by אֵת (liii. 11; cf. *μετά* in Luke xxii. 37) or עִם (Ps. lxxxviii. 5). There is here used בַּמָּה, not בְּמָה, because this looser form is usually found only when a relative clause follows (*eo quod*, see Eccles. iii. 22), and not בַּמָּה; because the long final vowel in this case is employed only when the succeeding word begins with א, or when במה stands in pause (as in 1 Kings xxii. 21); under all other circumstances בַּמָּה is used. The question thus introduced cannot be answered with a positive fixing of value; the worth of man, considered in himself, and apart from God, is as nothing.[1]

At this porism a pause is made in the announcement of judgment, but only for the purpose of gathering new strength. In four strophes, concluding in the same way, the prophet has proclaimed the divine judgment on every exalted thing in the world that has fallen from communion with God, just as

[1] In a fragment of Aeschylus preserved in Plutarch, *De Exil.*, Tantalus is represented as saying of himself: "My courage, which formerly reached to heaven, now sinks to earth, and cries to me, Learn not to esteem too highly what is of man."

Amos begins his book with a round of judgments, forming seven strophes which begin in the same way, and bursting forth like seven thunder-peals upon the nations on the stage of history; the seventh stroke falls on Judah, on whom, as on its proper object, the storm of judgment remains. Similarly with Isaiah here, the universal proclamation of judgment concentrates itself more especially on Judah and Jerusalem. The current of discourse now bursts the banks confining it in strophic form,—though otherwise it flows with freedom,—and the exhortation in ii. 22 not to trust in man, which rests on what has gone before, becomes the stepping-stone from the universal proclamation of judgment to the more special one in iii. 1, while the prophet assigns a new reason for the exhortation: "*For, behold, the Lord, Jehovah of hosts, removes from Jerusalem and from Judah support and means of support, every support of bread, and every support of water.*" That the announcement of judgment here begins anew is evident even from the name of God, הָאָדוֹן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת, with which Isaiah everywhere (i. 24, x. 16, 33, xix. 4) introduces the judicial dealings of God. Trust in man was the great sin especially prevailing in the times of Uzziah and Jotham. The national glory at that time carried within it the wrath of Jehovah, which began to break out even in the days of Ahaz, and during Hezekiah's reign was merely restrained, not changed. This outburst of wrath Isaiah here proclaims, describing how Jehovah is throwing down the Jewish State into ruins by removing from it the supports of its existence and the pillars of its fabric. In מַשְׁעֵן וּמַשְׁעֶנֶת the full idea is placed in the foreground; the two nouns, which are but one and the same word in different forms, and these determined by the gender (cf. Micah ii. 4; Nah. ii. 11; Zeph. i. 15, ii. 1; Ezek. xxi. 3; Ewald, § 172*b*), serve to generalize the notion: *fulcra omne genus* (*omnigena*). Both are "instrumental" forms, and signify that which is used in giving support, whereas מִשְׁעָן means what supports: hence the three perhaps correspond to the Latin *fulerum, fultura, fulcimen.* Of the various means of support, bread and water are first named, not in a figurative sense, but as the two absolutely indispensable conditions, and the basis of human life. Life is supported by bread and water (שָׁעָן being synonymous with סָעַד, Ps. civ. 15, etc.); it goes, as it

were, on the crutch of bread, and "to break the staff of bread" (Lev. xxvi. 26; Ezek. iv. 16, v. 16, xiv. 13; Ps. cv. 16) is thus equivalent to physical destruction. The fall of the Jewish State accordingly begins with the withdrawal from it by Jehovah of all support afforded by bread and water, all stores of both. And this was actually fulfilled; for, both in the Chaldean and in the Roman periods, Jerusalem perished under dreadful famines such as were threatened in Lev. xxvi. and especially Deut. xxviii.,—both chapters filled with curses to follow the commission of sin; on both occasions, the inhabitants were reduced to such extremity that women devoured their own children (Lam. ii. 20; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi. 3. 3, 4). No real objection, therefore, can be made against the opening of the enumeration with "every support of bread, and every support of water." Nevertheless these words are regarded by Hitzig, Knobel, Meier, Cheyne, and Reuss as a gloss. We grant that the transition from these words to what follows ("hero and man of war") shows a certain abruptness and want of homogeneity, and that this fact, of course, arouses suspicion; on the other hand, if they be omitted, we regretfully miss the arrangement of ver. 1 into two members (cf. xxv. 6).

Vers. 2 and 3 continue the enumeration of the supports which Jehovah takes away: "*Heroes and men of war, judges, and prophets, and soothsayers, and elders: captains of fifty, and highly respected men, and counsellors, and masters in art, and those skilled in muttering.*" As the State, under Uzziah and Jotham, had become a military one, the prophet in both verses begins with the mention of military officers: גִּבּוֹר is a commander who has already proved himself brave; אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה is the common soldier who is armed, and had been well trained (see Ezek. xxxix. 20); שַׂר חֲמִשִּׁים is the leader of a company consisting of fifty warriors (see 2 Kings i. 9, etc.; similar officers were also found in the Assyrian army). Moreover, the leading members of the State are mixed together, so that the picture here given presents great variety of colour: שֹׁפֵט is the officer appointed by the government to administer justice and carry out the law; זָקֵן is the oldest member of his family, and the senator appointed by the city corporations; יוֹעֵץ is the counsellor standing nearest the king; נָשׂוּא פָנִים (properly,

one whose face (*i.e.* personal appearance) is accepted—*i.e.* one who is beloved and respected: Saad. *wágîh*, from *wágh*, the face, appearance) is a person held in esteem, not merely in virtue of his office, but also on account of his wealth, age, benevolence, etc.; חֲכַם חֲרָשִׁים is in the LXX. rendered *σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων*, and very well explained by Jerome as *in artibus mechanicis exercitatus easque callide tractans*. In the Chaldean captivities, skilled artisans especially were carried away (2 Kings xxiv. 14 ff.; Jer. xxiv. 1, xxix. 2); hence there can be no doubt that חֲרָשִׁים, from the sing. חָרָשׁ (different from חֲרָשִׁים, workmen, the singular of which is חָרָשׁ, for חַרְשׁ,—though in 1 Chron. iv. 14, cf. Neh. xi. 35, we find the vocalization חֲרָשִׁים in this personal sense also, from חָרָשׁ, following the analogy of the form חָכָם), is intended to mean mechanical arts (not "magical arts," as Gesenius, Hitzig, and Meier affirm), and the חֲכַם חֲרָשִׁים therefore does not signify, as Ewald formerly rendered the expression, a sorcerer or wizard. The masters of the black art are introduced under the designation לַחַשׁ: נְבוֹן לָחַשׁ is the whisper, the muttering of magical formulas. Moreover, the master of the black art further comes before us under the name קֹסֵם, a term which (from the radical idea of making fast—as seen in קם; קשׁ,—swearing, conjuring), together with נָבִיא, the false prophet of Jehovah whose predictions are also merely קֹסֵם (Micah iii. 11; Ezek. xxii. 28), signifies a soothsayer that cherishes heathen superstition: the word is found as early as in Deut. xviii. 10, 14. After bread and water, these are the supports of the State. They are here intermingled thus, without any attempt at arrangement, because the mighty and magnificent State, properly regarded, is but a heterogeneous mixture of Judaism and heathenism, and the godless glory will become a mass of utter confusion when the wrath of Jehovah bursts forth.

Deprived of its proper foundation and torn from its grooves, the kingdom of Judah falls a prey to the most audacious despotism, as shown in ver. 4: "*And I give them boys as princes, and childish caprices shall rule over them.*" The revived glory of Solomon is thus anew followed, as before, by Rehoboam-times. The king is not expressly mentioned,—intentionally so: he has sunk to the mere shadow of a king; it is not he who rules, but the party of aristocrats around

him, who move him about like a puppet as they choose, treating him like one of themselves. Now, if it is in itself generally a misfortune when the king of a country is a lad (נַעַר, Eccles. x. 16), it is doubly so when the princes or magnates surrounding and advising him are also youths (נְעָרִים) or youngsters, in the bad sense of the term: this produces a government of תַּעֲלוּלִים. None of the nouns of this form has a personal meaning. According to the root-idea of the verb-stem, it is possible that the word may be explained (with Ewald, § 167*b*) as signifying "childishness," and this as being equivalent to "little children" (the abstract being used for the concrete, like *τὰ παιδικά*). But there is no need for supposing that תעלולים stands for עוללים (or מעוללים; see under ver. 12); or, what is comparatively more admissible, that it is an adverbial accusative (the opinion of Cheyne, who translates the passage, "and with wilfulness shall they rule over them"); for יִמְשְׁלוּ does not necessarily require a personal subject (cf. Ps. xix. 14, ciii. 19). The form תעלולים (which occurs only in the plural, and is formed like תַּנְחוּנִים) takes its meaning from the reflexive הִתְעַלֵּל, which signifies to meddle with, make sport of, give vent to one's caprice; hence this noun signifies "vexations, annoyances" (lxvi. 4). Jerome, who translates the word by *effeminati*, appears to have been thinking of הִתְעַלֵּל in an obscene sense; better is the rendering of the LXX. which gives *ἐμπαῖκται*, though *ἐμπαίγματα* would be more exact: here, in association with נערים, it denotes outbursts of youthful caprice, which, whether in joke or in earnest, do injury to others. It is not law and righteousness that will rule, but the very opposite of righteousness,—a course of conduct which treats the subjects as the helpless plaything, at one time of their lust (Judg. xix. 25), at another of their cruelty. Varying humour, utterly unregulated and unrestrained, rules supreme.

Then the people become like the government: passions are let loose, and all restraints of modesty are burst asunder. Ver. 5: "*And the people oppress one another, one this and another that; the boy breaks out furiously upon the old man, and the despised upon the honoured.*" As shown by the clause describing the mutual relation of the persons, נִגַּשׂ is a Niphal with reciprocal meaning (cf. נִלְחָם, xix. 2); this verb, followed

by ב, signifies to treat as a tyrant or taskmaster (see ix. 3). The meanest selfishness then stifles all nobler motives; one becomes a tyrant over another, and rude insolence takes the place of reverence, which, by the law of nature, as well as the Torah (Lev. xix. 32) and custom, is due to the aged and superiors from boys and those in the humbler ranks. נִקְלֶה (from קָלָה, which is synonymous with חָקַל, viii. 23, xxiii. 9; cf. xvi. 14; the root of which is קל, to be light, small) means one who belongs to the lowest stratum of society (1 Sam. xviii. 23), and is the opposite of נִכְבָּד (from כָּבֵד, to be difficult, weighty): the LXX. well renders *ὁ ἄτιμος πρὸς τὸν ἔντιμον*. When there is this disregard of the distinctions due to age and rank, the State in a short time becomes a wild and waste scene of confusion.

At last, there is no longer any authority bearing rule; even the desire to govern dies out, for despotism is followed by mob-rule, and this by anarchy in the most literal sense; distress becomes so great that he who has a coat (cloak), so as to be still able in some degree to clothe himself respectably, is besought to undertake the government. Vers. 6, 7: "*When a man shall lay hold of his brother in his father's house* [*and say*], '*Thou hast a cloak; thou shalt be our ruler, and take this ruin under thy hand*,' *he will cry out on that day, saying*, '*I do not want to be a surgeon, when there is in my house neither bread nor cloak; ye cannot make me ruler of the people*.'" The population will have become so lean and dispirited through hunger, that, with a little energy, it would be possible to decide, within the narrow circle of a family, who is to be ruler, and to carry out the decision. The father's house is the place where (בית being here the local accusative) one brother meets the other; and one breaks out into the following words of urgent entreaty, which are here introduced without לֵאמֹר (cf. xiv. 8, 16, also xxii. 16, xxxiii. 14). לְךָ is a rare mode of writing לָךְ, found also in Gen. xxvii. 37; תִּהְיֶה indicates the assumption, without any ceremony, that he will agree to what is expected. In Zeph. i. 3, מַכְשֵׁלָה means that through which one comes to ruin; here it means the thing itself that has been overthrown, and this because כָּשַׁל (not merely to stumble, trip, slip, but actually to tumble over after being thrown off the equilibrium by a

thrust from the outside) is not used of buildings that fall into ruin, and with a reference to the prosopopeia which follows in ver. 8. He who has the advantage over many, or all others, of still being able to clothe himself respectably (even though it were merely with a blouse) is to become supreme ruler or dictator (cf. קָצִין, Judg. xi. 6), and the State, now lying in a wretched state of ruin, is to be under his hand (*i.e.* his dominion, his protection and care: 2 Kings viii. 20; Gen. xli. 35; cf. xvi. 9, where, instead of the more usual singular יד, the plural is found). With ver. 7 begins the apodosis to the protasis introduced by כִּי as a particle of time. The answer given by the brother to the urgent request of those who make the appeal is introduced by the words, "he will raise (viz. his voice; see xxiv. 14) on that day, saying:" it is stated in this circumstantial manner because it is a solemn protest. He does not like to be חֹבֵשׁ, *i.e.* a binder (viz. of the broken arms and legs and ribs of the ruined State, xxx. 26, i. 6, lxi. 1). It is implied in the form אֶהְיֶה that he does not like it, because he is conscious of his inability. He has no confidence in himself, and the assumption that he has a coat is false; not merely has he no coat at home in his house (in view of which we must remember that the conversation is carried on in his father's house), but he has no bread; hence what is expected from him, almost naked and starving as he is, becomes impossible. "When the purple of the ruler," says the Midrash on Esth. iii. 6, "is offered for sale at the market, then woe to the buyer and the seller alike!"

This deep and tragic misery, as the prophet proceeds to show in vers. 8–12, is righteous retribution. Ver. 8: "*For Jerusalem is overthrown and Judah is fallen, because their tongue and their doings are against Jehovah, to defy the eyes of His glory.*" The name of the city of Jerusalem is regularly (Gesen. § 122. 3*a*) treated as feminine, the name of the people of Judah as masculine; names of nations appear as feminines only when there is a blending of the two ideas, the country and the people (as, for instance, Job i. 15). The two preterites כָּשְׁלָה and נָפַל express the general fact which will prove the occasion of such scenes of misery as have just been described. The second clause (a substantive one), on the other hand, beginning with כִּי, assigns already

present sin, not sin still future, as the reason of the coming judgment. אֶל is employed to indicate hostile direction, as in ii. 4; Gen. iv. 8; Num. xxxii. 14; Josh. x. 6. The capital and the country are in word and deed against Jehovah לַמְרוֹת עֵינֵי כְבוֹדוֹ. Here עֵינֵי = עֵינֵי and לַמְרוֹת (as in Ps. lxxviii. 17) is the syncopated Hiphil inf. for לְהַמְרוֹת (cf. the syncopated forms in xxiii. 11, i. 12). The Qal מָרָה, which is likewise pretty often construed with the accusative, means to reject in a contumacious manner, and the Hiphil הִמְרָה to treat contumaciously, — properly, to oppose strenuously, *ἀντιτείνειν*, *obniti*: the root is מר, מרר, *stringere*, and this is connected with מַר, the name of anything bitter, as being astringent, though there is no warrant for the rendering in the LXX. of מָרָה, הִמְרָה, הֵמַר, Ex. xxiii. 21, by *παραπικραίνειν*. The לְ is a somewhat shortened expression for לְמַעַן, Amos ii. 7; Jer. vii. 18, xxxii. 29. But what does the prophet mean by "the eyes of His glory"? The construction is certainly just the same as is "the arm of His holiness" (lii. 10), and a reference to the divine attributes is thus intended. The glory of God is that eternal manifestation of His holy nature in its splendour which man pictures to himself anthropomorphically, because he cannot conceive of anything more sublime than the human form. It is in this glorious form that Jehovah looks upon His people. In this is mirrored His condescending yet jealous love, His holy love which breaks forth into wrath against all who requite His love with hate.

But Israel, instead of living in the consciousness of being a constant and favoured object of these majestic and earnestly admonishing eyes, is studiously defying them in word and deed, not even hiding its sin through fear of them, but exposing it to view all unabashed. Ver. 9: "*The appearance of their faces testifies against them*, and *their sin they declare like Sodom, without concealing it; woe to their soul! for they do evil to themselves.*" In any case, what is meant is the insolent look which their sinfulness is stamping upon their faces, without the self-condemnation which in others takes the form of dread to commit sin (Seneca, *de vita beata*, c. 12). The construct form הַכָּרַת, if derived from הכר (Jos. Kimchi and Luzzatto), would follow the analogy of בַּקֶּרֶת

in Ezek. xxxiv. 12. But הכר = Arab. *hakara* (*hakira*), affords no suitable meaning; הַכָּרָה is the active noun formed from the Hiphil הִכִּיר. The common expression הִכִּיר פָּנִים signifies to look searchingly, inquiringly, keenly into the face of a person, to fix the eye upon him; and, when used of a judge, to take the side of a person, by showing undue regard to him (Deut. i. 17, xvi. 19). This latter meaning, however ("their respect of persons," "their partiality," Prov. xxiv. 23, xxviii. 21), though supported by Hitzig, Maurer, and Gesenius, is inadmissible here, simply because the words do not refer to judges specially, but to the whole nation. "The appearance of their faces" is to be understood here in an objective sense, their look (τὸ εἶδος, Luke ix. 29), as the *agnitio* of Jerome is also to be taken as meaning *id quo se agnoscendum dat vultus eorum.* This is probably the usual Hebrew designation for what we call physiognomy,—the meaning indicated by the expression of the face, and then the latter itself. The expression of their countenance testifies against them (עָנָה בְ as in lix. 12); for it is the distorted and troubled image of their sin that cannot and will not hide itself. They do not even content themselves, however, with this open though silent display; they further speak openly of their sin, making no concealment of it, like the Sodomites who proclaimed their fleshly lust (Gen. chap. xix.). Jerusalem is, in fact, spiritually Sodom, as the prophet called it in i. 10. Through such shameful sinning they do themselves harm (גָּמַל, allied to גָּמַר, signifies to complete, then to carry out, to show by actual deed): this is the undeniable fact, the actual experience.

But seeing it is the curse of sin that the knowledge of what is perfectly clear and self-evident is just what is marred and even obliterated for man, the prophet dwells still longer on the fact that all sin is self-destruction and self-murder, presenting this general truth with its opposite in palilogic fashion, like the Apostle John, and calling to his contemporaries in vers. 10, 11: "*Say of the just, that it is well with him; for they will enjoy the fruit of their doings. Woe to the wicked! it is ill; for what his hands have wrought will be done to him.*" What is declared in Prov. xii. 14 is here re-echoed in prophetic form. We cannot, with Vitringa and

some modern commentators, translate "Praise the righteous one;" for, though אָמַר is sometimes construed with the accusative (Ps. xl. 11, cxlv. 6, 11), it never means to praise, but to utter, express (see also Ps. xl. 11). We have here the transposition familiar to us even from Gen. i. 4,—simple and natural in the case of the verbs רָאָה (cf. also xxii. 9; Ex. ii. 2), יָדַע (1 Kings v. 17), and אָמַר (like λέγειν, John ix. 19): *dicite justum quod bonus = dicite justum esse bonum* (Ewald, § 336*b*): the object of seeing, knowing, or saying is first mentioned generally, and then what qualifies it or defines it in some way. טוֹב and, in ver. 11, רָע (רַע when not in pause) might both be the 3rd sing. perfect of their verbs, used in a neuter sense: טוֹב, "it is well," viz. to him (as in Deut. v. 30; Jer. xxii. 15 f.); and רַע (from רָעַע), "it is ill" (as in Ps. cvi. 32). But Jer. xliv. 17 shows that we may also say טוֹב הוּא, רַע הוּא, in the sense of *καλῶς ἔχει*, *κακῶς ἔχει*, and that both expressions have been so regarded, and hence in both cases do not need לוֹ to be supplied. The form of the first favours this, while in the second the accentuation vacillates between אוי with *Tifcha*, לרשׁע with *Munach*, and אוי with *Merkah*, לרשׁע with *Tifcha;* the latter mode of accentuation, however, which favours the personal view of רע, is presented by important editions (such as those of Breschia, 1494; Pesaro, 1516; Venice, 1515 and 1521), and rightly preferred by Luzzatto and Baer. The summary statements, "the righteous is well," "the wicked is ill," are established by the latter end of both, in the light of which the previous misfortune of the righteous appears as good fortune, and the previous good fortune of the wicked as misfortune. With reference to this difference in the eventual fate of each, the call "say," which is common to both clauses, summons to a recognition of the good fortune of the one and the ill fortune of the other. O that Judah and Jerusalem recognised this for their salvation, ere it becomes too late! For the state of the poor nation is already sad enough, and they are very near destruction.

Ver. 12: "*My people,—its oppressors are boys, and women rule over it; my people, thy leaders are misleaders, and they have swallowed the way of thy paths.*" The idea that מְעוֹלֵל signifies those who maltreat or abuse others, is opposed by

the parallel נָשִׁים; moreover, the notion of despotic treatment is already contained in נֹגְשָׂיו. Along with women, one expects to find children;[1] and this, too, מְעוֹלֵל means, but not a suckling (Ewald, § 160*a*), like עוּל and עָוִיל (see our commentary on Job xvi. 11), for the active form requires an active idea; but עוּל does not mean "to suckle" (rather to support, nourish), much less then "to suck," so that it would thus need to signify the suckling in the sense of one who is nourished. This is improbable, however, for the simple reason that it occurs in Jer. xliv. 7 and Lam. ii. 11 along with יוֹנֵק, and thus cannot have exactly the same meaning as the latter word, but, like עוֹלֵל and עוֹלָל (the former of which may have been contracted from מְעוֹלֵל), signifies a boy as playful and wanton (*lascivum*, *protervum*): see the remarks on ver. 4 (where תַּעֲלוּלִים occurs with נְעָרִים), and cf. the Bedouinic עאליל, plur. *ʿawâlil*, with the sense of *juvencus* (a young bull, three or four years old). Böttcher correctly renders the word by *pueri* (*lusores*); מעולל, however, is not, as he supposes, in itself a collective form, but the singular is used collectively; or perhaps better still, the predicate is meant to apply to every individual included in the plural idea of the subject (cf. xvi. 8, xx. 4; Gesenius, § 145. 5), so that the meaning is,—the oppressors of the people, every one without exception, are (even though advanced in years), in their way of thinking and acting, like boys or youths, who make all those subject to them the plaything of their capricious humour. The person of the king — נגשיו being understood by Hitzig, Ewald, and Cheyne as a plural of excellence—is here also placed in the background; but the female sway, afterwards mentioned, points us to the court. This must have been the state of the case when Ahaz, a young spendthrift, twenty years of age (according to the LXX., twenty-five), came to the throne, after the end of Jotham's reign. Once more the prophet, with deep pain, repeats the words "my people," and, addressing them directly, passes from the rulers of the nation to the preachers,—for the מְאַשְּׁרִים are prophets (Micah iii. 5); but what characters!

[1] An Arabic proverb (*Cat. Codd. Lips.* p. 373) runs thus: "I flee to God in order to escape from the domination of boys and the government of women."

Instead of leading the people on the straight road, they lead them astray (ix. 15; cf. 2 Kings xxi. 9); for, as we know from the history of this gang of prophets, they ministered to the godless interests of the court, making themselves the slaves either of the dynasty or the demagogues; or they pandered to the desires of the people, which were of no higher tone. Moreover, "the way of the path" of the people (*i.e.* the main-road or highway, by the branches of which the people were to reach the goal designed by God) have they "swallowed" (*i.e.* taken away the eyes and feet of the people), so that they cannot find it and walk in it. Nägelsbach renders this passage differently,—"they drag down thy path of life into destruction;" but the solemn nature of the expression rather points to the conclusion that "way" means law, or the path of duty (Theodoret, Jerome, Luther). Whatever is swallowed is invisible; it has disappeared without leaving a trace behind. "To swallow," in the sense of *deglutire,* is expressed by the Qal, as in xxviii. 4; the Piël בִּלַּע signifies absorption, in the sense of annihilation. The way of salvation shown in the law is no more to be seen or heard; it has perished, as it were, in the preaching of the false prophets with their misleading doctrines.

Such is the state of matters. The exhortations of the prophet have no great range or breadth of view, for he must ever recur to the announcement of judgment. The judgment of the world comes anew before his mind in ver. 13: "*Jehovah is standing to plead, and has stepped forward to judge the nations.*" When Jehovah, wearied of exercising patience, arises from His heavenly throne, this is called קוּם, as in ii. 19, 21, xxxiii. 10; when He sits down on the judgment-seat before the eyes of all the world, this is called יָשַׁב, as in Ps. ix. 5; Jonah iv. 12; when He descends from heaven (Micah i. 2 ff.) and comes forward as accuser, this is called נָצַב or עָמַד, Ps. lxxxii. 1,—the latter word signifies to go forward and stand, in contrast with sitting; while the former means to stand, with the additional idea of being firm, fixed in purpose, ready. But Jehovah's pleading (רִיב, Jer. xxv. 31) is likewise judging (דִּין), because His accusation, which cannot possibly be denied as false, is at the same time the sentence of condemnation; and this sentence, which

irresistibly operates, is at the same time also the execution of the punishment. Thus God stands—Accuser and Judge and Executioner in one Person — in the midst of the nations (Ps. vii. 8). But among the nations it is Israel specially, and among the Israelites it is particularly the leaders of the poor misguided and neglected people against whom He stands, as shown in vers. 14, 15: "*Jehovah will enter into judgment with the elders of His people and their princes,—and you, ye have eaten up the vineyard; the plunder of the sufferer is in your houses. What do you want, that you crush my people, and grind the face of those in suffering? Declaration of the Lord Jehovah of hosts.*" With the first part of ver. 14 cf. Ps. cxliii. 2. The address of God begins with וְאַתֶּם; the clause to which this "and ye" (or "but ye") forms the contrast is wanting, just as in Ps. ii. 6, where the address of God begins with וְאֲנִי, "and I" = "but I." The suppressed clause, however, is easily supplied in some such way as this: "I set you over my vineyard, but ye have eaten up the vineyard." The question has been asked whether it is God Himself who silently passes over this clause, or the prophet; but certainly it is Jehovah Himself. The majesty with which He comes before the rulers of His people of itself practically and undeniably declares, even without express statement in words, that their majesty is but a shadow of His, and that their office is held from Him and under Him. But their office is owing to God's having committed His people to their care; the vineyard of Jehovah is His people, —a figure which the prophet, in chap. v., forms into a parable. Jehovah appointed them to be keepers and preserves of this vineyard, but they have themselves become the cattle (בְּעִיר) which they were to drive off; the verb בָּעַר is used in speaking of the cattle that utterly devour the stalks of what grows in a field, or the tender vines in a vineyard (Ex. xxii. 4). The property of which their unhappy fellow-countrymen have been robbed is in their houses, and attests the plundering that has been carried on in the vineyard. הָעָנִי forms an explanation of הַכֶּרֶם; for a lowly and distressful condition is the usual lot of the community which God calls His vineyard; it is an oppressed Church, but woe to the oppressors! In the question מַלְּכֶם there is implied the

want of understanding and the bold insolence of the beginning they have made: מָה is here, after the manner of a prefix, fused into one word with לָכֶם, as in Ex. iv. 1; Ezek. viii. 6; Mal. i. 13. The *Qerî*, by resolving the *Kethîb*, helps us to understand the meaning. מַלְּכֶם should properly be followed by כִּי (*quid est vobis quod atteritis populum meum*, as in xxii. 1, 16), but the discourse hurries on (as in Jonah i. 6) because it is an outburst of wrath. Hence also the expressions setting forth the conduct of the rulers of the people are the strongest possible. דְּכָא occurs also in Prov. xxii. 22, but טָחַן פְּנֵי is a strong metaphor of which no other example is found. The former signifies to beat (or pound), while the latter (the extreme opposite of חִלָּה פְּנֵי) means to grind small (to powder), as the millstone grinds the grain. They beat the face of those who are already bowed down, repelling them with such merciless harshness that they stand as if they were annihilated, and their face becomes pale and white, from oppression and despair,—or even (without any reference to the loss of colour) so that their joyful appearance is exchanged for the features and gait of men in despair. Thus far, language still affords figurative expressions fitted in some measure for describing the conduct of the rulers of Israel, but it lacks the power of adequately expressing the boundless immorality of this conduct; hence the greatness of their wicked cruelty is set before them for consideration in the form of a question: "What is it to you?" *i.e.* what kind of unutterable wickedness is this you are beginning? Thus the prophet hears Jehovah speak,—the majestic Judge whom he here calls אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת (to be read *Adōnāy Elōhîm Zebaōth*, according to the traditional vocalization). This threefold name of God, which pretty frequently occurs in Amos, and also in Jer. ii. 19, first appears in the Elohistic psalm lxix. (ver. 7),—as this judgment-scene generally is painted with psalm-colours, and especially reminds us of Ps. lxxxii. (Elohistic, and a psalm of Asaph).

But though the prophet has this judgment-scene thus vividly and dramatically before him, yet he cannot help breaking off, even after he has but begun the description; for another message of Jehovah comes to him. It is for the women of Jerusalem, whose sway is now, when the prophet

is delivering his burden, not one whit less influential in the capital (see ver. 12, beginning) than that of their husbands, who had forgotten their calling. Vers. 16, 17: "*And Jehovah hath spoken: Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with necks stretched forth and twinkling with the eyes, walk with tripping gait, and tinkle with their foot ornaments; therefore the Lord maketh the crown of the head of Zion's daughters scabbed, and Jehovah will make bare their secret parts.*" Their pride of heart (גָּבַהּ is used as in Ezek. xvi. 50, cf. Zeph. iii. 11) reveals itself in their outward conduct. They go with outstretched neck, *i.e.* bending back the fore part of the neck, seeking to make themselves taller than they are, since they think themselves exceedingly great. Cornelius à Lapide here remarks: *instar gruum vel cygnorum; habitus hic est insolentis ac procacis.* (The *Qerî* here substitutes the usual form נְטוּיֹת, but Isaiah perhaps intentionally employed the more rare and rugged form נְטוּוֹת, for this form actually occurs in 1 Sam. xxv. 18, as also its singular נְטוּ for נְטוּי in Job xv. 22, xli. 25.) Moreover, they go twinkling (מְשַׂקְּרוֹת, not מְשַׂקְּרוֹת, "falsifying") the eyes (like גָּרוֹן, the accusative of closer specification), *i.e.* in pretended innocence casting wanton and amatory glances about them (LXX. *νεύματα ὀφθαλμῶν*): this participle comes from שָׂקַר=שָׂקַר, not in the sense of *fucare* (Targum, *Shabbath* 62*b*, *Yoma* 9*b*, Luther), properly "to dye reddish-yellow" (*Pesikta*, ed. Buber, 132*a*, "with red collyrium;" Talm. שרק, parall. כחל, *Kethuboth* 17*a*); but secondarily to paint the face. This derived sense is in itself not probable here, from the simple fact that the painting of the eyelids black with powdered antimony (פּוּךְ, liv. 11) was not considered a piece of vanity, but regarded as an indispensable item of female adornment. The verb is rather used in the sense of *nictare* (LXX. Vulgate, Syriac, cf. Saad. "making their eyes flash"), syn. רָמַז, cf. כָּקַר, Syr. to squint, Targ. = עָוַג, Job xx. 9. Compare also the Talmudic witticism, "God did not create the woman out of Adam's ear, lest she might become an eavesdropper (צַיְתָנִית); nor out of Adam's eye, lest she might become a winker (סַקְרָנִית)."[1]

[1] Cf. also *Sota* 47*b*: "Since there has been increase in the number of women with extended neck and winking eyes, there has also been increase of the cases in which the curse-water (Num. v. 18) had to be used." To

The third descriptive clause states that they walk *incedendo et saliendo:* the second infinitive absolute is here, as usual, that which gives the definite colour to the expression, while the other keeps before the eye the occurrence that would be denoted by the verb in its finite form. They go skipping along (טָפַף, cf. طَفَّ طَفَرَ, to spring, so called from drawing the feet together; hence טַף, the skipping little family), *i.e.* taking short and tripping steps, almost always placing the heel at the great toe, as the Talmud everywhere says. The LXX. gives a rendering of interest for the history of luxury in dress: *καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν ἅμα σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας.* Quite as appropriate, but contrary to the meaning of the words, is the rendering of Luther, "they walk along and waggle," *i.c. clunibus agitatis,* a meaning for which the Semitic has other expressions (see *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft,* xvi. 587).[1] But the rendering should rather be "tripping;" for only such little steps can they take, owing to their pace-chains, which join together the costly foot-rings (עֲכָסִים) that were placed above the ankle. With these pace-chains, which perhaps even then as now, were sometimes provided with little bells, they make a tinkling sound,—an idea which is here expressed by the denominative verb עָכַס; with their feet they make a tinkling sound, clinking the ankle-ornaments, by placing the feet in such a way as to make these ankle-rings strike one another. In view of this fact, בְּרַגְלֵיהֶם for בְּרַגְלֵיהֶן is perhaps not an unintentional interchange of gender; they are not modest *virgines,* but bold *viragines,* and thus in their own persons display a *synallage generis.* This coquettish clinking,

such an extent, indeed, did the evil grow, as is well known, that Johanan ben Zaccai, the pupil of Hillel, completely abolished the ordeal of the Sota (*i.e.* the woman suspected of adultery); his contemporaries were thoroughly adulterous (*μοιχαλίς*). Synonymous with מְשֻׁקְּרוֹת is *paeta,* a Latin epithet of Venus, which Philoxenus glosses by *μύωψ τοῖς ὄμμασι*; but a different meaning is conveyed by *ὑγρά,* which also is a term having reference to the eyes.

[1] The translation of the Targum וּבְפָתְהֶן מַקְּפָן is explained in the same way by Gesenius (*Thesaurus,* p. 554) to mean *clunes agitantes,* but more correctly by Rashi to signify "putting on false hair-toupees," פָּאתָא=פָּתָא (הַפָּאָה). See Levy's *Targumic Dictionary,* under נָקַף I. and פָּאתָא.

though forbidden by the Qoran, is still the delight of women in Moslem Oriental countries at the present day, as the women of Jerusalem enjoyed it in Isaiah's days. Great is the attractive influence of natural charms, especially when enhanced by lavish employment of art; but the prophet, blind to this display of splendour, sees only the filthiness within, and announces to the women of rank a foul and by no means aesthetic fate. The Almighty will smite with scab the crown of their head, from which long hair now flows down (וְיַשְׂפַּח has ו consecutive, and, at the same time, forms the apodosis; the verb is a "denominative" from סַפַּחַת, which means the scab or scurf which deposits itself on the skin); and Jehovah, by delivering them over to the violation of and insult of coarse enemies, will uncover their nakedness, —the greatest disgrace in the eyes of a woman, who covers herself as carefully as possible from every stranger (xlvii. 3; Nah. iii. 5; Jer. xiii. 22; Ezek. xvi. 37). The noun פֹּת is derived from a verb פּוּת (Arab. *faut, tefâwut*, signifying *intercapedo*), so that פֻּתֵּהֶן or פִּתְּהֶן (cf. Stade, § 353*b*, and, further, אַתֶּן for אַתֶּן in Ezek. xxxiv. 31) is thus a designedly disrespectful term; cf. פֶּתַח, plur. פְּתָחוֹת, a Biblical and Talmudic word signifying *cardo femina*. The Babylonians read פַּתְּהֶן from פַּת, which is rather derived from פְּתָה (cf. יְרֵכָן; also פְּתַח in the sense of *vulva*, in *Pesachim* 87*a*; and in explanation of this passage, *Shabbath* 62*b*).[1]

The prophet now proceeds in vers. 18–23 to describe further how the Lord will tear from them their whole toilet as plunder for their foes: "*On that day will the Lord remove the splendour of the ankle-clasps, and of the forehead-bands, and of the crescents; the ear-drops, and the arm-chains, and the light veils; the tiaras, and the stepping-chains, and the girdles, and the smelling-bottles, and the amulets; the finger-rings and the nose-rings; the gala-dresses, and the sleeved-frocks, and the wrapping-cloaks, and the pockets; the hand-mirrors, and the*

[1] Luzzatto explains פֹּת by the Aram. פּוּתָא, "forehead;" but this word, the full form of which is אַפּוּתָא, is equivalent to אַפָּא, אַפְיָא, the face or countenance; moreover, the Syriac *fût* (whence comes *lfût* = לְפֵי), which Bernstein regards as a collateral form from *fûm*, פּוּם, the "mouth," is the apocopated *apût* = *apai*.

Sindu-covers, and the turbans, and the gauze-mantles." The oldest commentary on this passage, important for the information it affords regarding ancient costumes, though itself needing explanation, is found in the Jerusalem Talmud, *Shabbath* vi. 4. Later writers who have industriously treated of these articles of female dress are Nic. Wilh. Schröder, in his *Commentarius de vestitu mulierum Hebraearum ad Jes.* iii. 16–24 (Lugd. Batav. 1745, 4to), and Ant. Theod. Hartmann (sometime Professor in Rostock), in his work entitled, *Die Hebräerin am Putztische und als Braut*, 1809–10 (3 vols. 8vo); cf. Saalschütz's *Archäologie* (1885), chap. 3 of which treats of the dress of men and women; and Sal. Rubin, נאוֹן יהודה וירושלים (on the luxury, love of show, and mode of living among the Hebrew women referred to in the Bible), in vol. i. of the monthly magazine called השחר (also published separately, Vienna 1870). [See also Keil's *Biblical Archaeology* (English translation, Edinburgh 1888), vol. ii. 142.] It is not customary elsewhere with Isaiah to be so detailed in his descriptions; among all the prophets, Ezekiel most displays this style of writing (see, for example, chap. xvi.); nor do we find anything similar again in other prophecies against women (cf. xxxii. 9 ff.; Amos iv. 1 ff.). Here ends the enumeration of articles of female finery and show; and while it forms a trilogy with the enumeration of the props of State in iii. 1–3, and the enumeration in ii. 13–16 of persons and things lofty and exalted, it has its own special ground in the boundless love of ornament which had become prevalent especially during the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, it is intended to make a serious impression, and yet show the ridiculous character of the unrestrained luxury actually existing; for it is the prophet's design in this address throughout to draw a sharp contrast between the titanic, party-coloured, noisy, worldly glory, and the true glory, which is spiritual, grandly simple, and shows itself in working outwards from within. Indeed, the subject of the whole address is the course of universal judgment from false glory to the true. The general idea of "splendour" or "glory" (תִּפְאֶרֶת), which stands at the head and forms the foundation of the whole, already points to the contrast which follows in iv. 2, with quite another kind of glory.

In explaining each particular term, we must content ourselves with stating what is most necessary and comparatively most certain regarding the words which here occur. עֲכָסִים (from עָכַס, عكس عكش, to bind, see the remarks on lix. 5) are rings worn round the ankles, and made of gold, silver, or ivory: hence the denominative verb עָכַס (used in ver. 16), to make a clinking sound with these rings. שְׁבִיסִים (from שָׁבַס=שָׁבַן, to weave) are bands woven of gold or silver thread, worn on the forehead and under the hair-net, and extending from one ear to the other; plausible, but less probable, is the explanation current since Schröder's time, that the word means sun-like balls (שְׁמִיסִים), worn as ornaments round the neck (Arab. *šumeisa, šubeisa*, a little sun). שַׁהֲרֹנִים are *bullulae* of this kind, moon-shaped ornaments (Arab. شهر, Aram. סהר, moon), fastened round the neck, and hanging down on the breast (Judg. viii. 26; cf. 21, royal ornaments), half-moons or crescents (*hilâlat*), like those of which an Arabic girl usually possesses several kinds, for the *hilâl* (new moon) is an emblem of increasing good fortune,[1] and, as such, the most approved means of warding off the evil eye.[2] נְטִפוֹת are ear-drops (found in Judg. viii. 26 as a designation of the ornament worn by Midianite kings); hence the Arab. *munaṭṭafa*, a female adorned with ear-rings. שְׁרוֹת (from שָׁרַר, to twist) are chains, and these, too (according to the Targum), chains for the arms, or spangles for the wrists, corresponding to the spangles for the ankles; the arm-chain or bracelet is still at the present day called *siwâr* (hence the denominative سور, to present or adorn with a bracelet). רְעָלוֹת are veils (from רָעַל, Aram.

[1] In this sense the crescent is the sign (*wasm*) with which the tribe of the *Ruwale* mark their herds as their property.

[2] "Amulet" and "talisman" are both words derived from the Arabic; the former comes from حميلة instead of the plural حمائل (from حمل, to bear, carry), which is more usual in this sense,—see, however, Gildemeister (in the *Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xxxviii. 140–142), who considers *amoletum* an old Latin word: the latter is from طلسم, the Arabic form of τέλεσμα.

רעל, רגל, غرل, to be loose and flaccid, to hang down or hang over loosely); these were more costly and of better quality than the ordinary veil worn by maidens, which is called צָעִיף. פְּאֵרִים are *tiaras;* the term occurs elsewhere in Scripture only in passages in which the word is applied to coverings for the heads of men (the priests, the bridegroom, and persons of rank). צְעָדוֹה are the stepping-chains (from צַעֲדָה, which primarily means a step or pace; then the little chain which makes the pace short and elegant). קִשֻּׁרִים (from קָשַׁר, to gird) are dress girdles, such as the bride wears on the marriage-day (cf. Jer. ii. 22 with Isa. xlix. 18); the Targum wrongly renders קַלְמַסְמְנֵיָא hair-pins (*καλαμίδες*). בָּתֵּי נֶפֶשׁ are holders of scent (נֶפֶשׁ being used only here in the sense of the breath of an aroma). Luther appropriately renders the expression "musk-apples," *i.e.* capsules filled with musk. לְחָשִׁים (from לָחַשׁ, to whisper, to work magically) are amulets worn either as charms or as a protection against witchcraft, perhaps something like the later קמיעות (*Shabbath* 60*a*), *i.e.* small plates with an inscription, or small bunches of plant-roots with sanative powers. טַבָּעוֹת (from טָבַע, to sink into, seal) are signet-rings worn on the finger, corresponding to the חוֹתָם worn by men on a string hanging down over the breast. נִזְמֵי הָאַף are the nose-rings in common use from patriarchal times (Gen. xxiv. 22) till the present, generally put through the right nostril, and hanging down over the mouth; they are different from חַח (a word occurring seven times), which is the ring put through the nose of animals, though this term is also found along with נזם in Ex. xxxv. 22 as the designation of an ornament.[1] מַחֲלָצוֹת are garments such as a person of rank brings out and presents to another,—gala-dresses, robes of honour (from חָלַץ, خلع, to draw out; as a denominative verb it signifies to put on a gala-dress); the Arab. is خَلَعَ (usually pronounced خَلْعَةٌ, whence our "gala," Spanish *gala;* it does not come from حَلَى = חָלְיָה, jewellery, ornaments).

[1] This נֶזֶם signifies also an ear-ring, which afterwards came to be called עָגִיל by way of distinction; see the essay on "Ohrgehänge (נזמים) als götzendienerisches Geräth," in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, x. (1872) pp. 45–48.

מַעֲטָפָה is the second tunic or frock, which was worn over the ordinary one,—the Roman *stola*. מִטְפָּחוֹת (from טָפַח, to spread out) are wrappers or broad wrapping-cloths,[1] like the one which Ruth wore when she crept close to Boaz in her best attire (Ruth iii. 15). חֲרִיטִים (here written הָחֲרִיטִים with the article, according to the Masora) are pockets into which people put money (2 Kings v. 23), which at other times is carried in the girdle or in a purse (כִּיס). גְּלִינִים (according to LXX. *διαφανῆ λακωνικά, sc. ἱμάτια*) are Lacedaemonian gauze or crape dresses, which reveal rather than conceal the nakedness (from גָּלָה in the sense of laying bare); Kimchi (in his Lexicon, under גָּלָה) compares the Arab. جلوء, a transparent dress; but the word is more certainly mirrors with handles, polished plates of metal (from גָּלָה, جلا, جلى, in the primary sense of making smooth), for גְּלָיוֹן elsewhere signifies a smooth table, as in the later Hebrew it means the empty space on the page of a book, the margin.[2] סְדִינִים are veils or coverings made of the finest linen, perhaps of Sindu or Hindu texture (*σινδόνες*); for *Sindu*, the country of the Indus, is the ancient name of India (see our commentary on Prov. xxxi. 24).[3] צְנִיפוֹת (from צָנַף, to roll up) are the turbans or headbands formed of cloths of various colours, twisted round the head.

[1] The term מִטְפָּחָה is very commonly used in the Mishna and the Gemara to signify a wrapping-cloth, such as a bath-sheet, or a cloth in which articles (*e.g.* the Levitical utensils) are wrapped up, a cloth for wiping off (such as a hand towel or bath towel); see, for example, *Kelim* xxiv. 13, xxviii. 5. On the other hand, מהלצות has no connection with the Mishnic term מהצלות, which means plaited mats for covering and laying on the top of an object, but not for folding round anything.

[2] The Jerusalem Talmud everywhere explains גלינים by גלגלייה, and in *Bereschith rabba* c. 19, גליון occurs as a specific article belonging to the class of חֲנֻרֹת, corresponding to the articles of male attire named קולסין, *galeae*; Levy accordingly renders it by "headband," and derives it from גלי=גלל. But, as shown by the use of the word in other passages, the root does not mean to roll or wind, but to make smooth, or lay bare.

[3] The Mishna (*Kelim* xxiv. 13) distinguishes between three kinds of סדינין, the material used for bed-clothes, the material used for curtains, and that used for embroidering. The Sindon is pretty often mentioned as a covering for the body; and in *Menachoth* 41*a* we read סדינא לקיטא וסרבלא לסתוא, "the sindon is summer clothing, the sarbal (cloak) is winter clothing,"—a passage which explains Mark xiv. 51 f.

רְדִידִים (from רָדַד = רָדַד, to spread out) are wide mantles, light and loose, for throwing over the shoulders and the body.

No mention is made of stockings and pocket-handkerchiefs; the former were not introduced into Western Asia from Media till long after Isaiah's time, and a lady of Jerusalem needed a pocket-handkerchief as little as one of Greece or Rome. The *σουδάρια καὶ σιμικίνθια* mentioned in Acts xix. 12 were not used for cleaning the nose. Nor did the veil (*burḳa'*), now commonly used for muffling the face, excepting the eyes, form a portion of female dress among the ancient Israelites.[1] The prophet mentions together twenty-one articles of personal adornment, a threefold evil seven, especially for the husbands of these State dolls. In the enumeration there is no order observed, — from above downwards, or from without inwards; there is as little arrangement in it as in the whole array of attire itself.

When Jehovah now will take away all this grandeur with which the women of Jerusalem are laden, they will become wretched-looking captives, disfigured by ill-treatment and dirt. Ver. 24: "*And instead of balmy fragrance there will be a mouldy smell, and instead of a sash a rope, and instead of artistic dressing of hair a baldness, and instead of a wide cloak a frock of sackcloth, branding instead of beauty.*" Then, in place of the בֹּשֶׂם (*i.e.* the odour arising from the powder of balsam, and aromatic powder in general) there comes mouldiness (מַק, as in v. 24, the dust of things that have rotted or moulded away) from which a dust may be raised, and the smell of which cannot but be felt; and in place of the חֵגוֹרָה (the beautifully embroidered girdle, Prov. xxxi. 24) there shall be נְקֻפָּה. This word signifies neither a "wound" (as interpreted by the Targum and Talmud) nor "rags" (the opinion of Knobel in his first edition), — views which find some support in the derivation from נָקַף as meaning to smite through, cut through,—but it denotes the rope (as rightly rendered in

[1] Rashi remarks on *Shabbath* 65*a*, "The Israelitish women in Arabia go out veiled (רְעוּלוֹת, wearing a veil that muffles the countenance), while those in India go out פְּרוּפוֹת (with a cloak fastened together above, about the mouth)."

the LXX. Vulgate, and Syriac) which is thrown over them as prisoners: the word is derived from נָקַף, to turn round, revolve, and is thus the feminine of a masc. נֵקֶף or נָקֶף: it is unnecessary to assume the existence of a verb קָפָה=קָוָה, signifying to twist (as is done by Meier, and by Knobel in his second edition).[1] A baldness takes the place of מַעֲשֵׂה מִקְשֶׁה (not מַעֲשֵׂה, so that the second noun is in apposition, as in the case of two indeterminate notions; see also Ezek. xxii. 18; 1 Chron. xv. 19, etc.; cf. also the remarks on xxx. 20), *i.e.* not (as the LXX. renders) a golden head-ornament, though מקשה in other passages signifies embossed or carved work in metal or wood: by "artificial turned-work" is here meant hair either crisped with the curling-iron, or artificially plaited and set up, which custom compels them to cut off in times of mourning (xv. 2, xxii. 12), or which falls off from them through grief. A מַחֲגֹרֶת שָׂק, *i.e.* a smock of coarse hair-cloth, comes in place of the פְּתִיגִיל, *i.e.* dress cloak (from פָּתַג, the root of which is פת, to be open, spreading, with the noun-ending *il*: *Targ.* לְבוּשׁ=פְּתָגָא, סְדִין; by the old interpreters, beginning with the Talmud, the word was misunderstood, as if it were a compound of פְּתִי and גִּיל); and in place of beauty comes כִּי, a branding mark (= כְּוִי, the cognate form being כְּוִיָּה, which occurs in the legal enactment, Ex. xxi. 25; the word is derived from כָּוָה, Arab. كوى, which is especially used of cauterizing with the مِكْوَاة, *i.e.* red-hot iron, as practised by surgeons), which is burnt by the conquerors into their forehead, though proud and beautiful as Juno's. For כִּי (Arab. كَيّ) is a noun,[2] not a particle, as in Jer. ii. 34; in correct codices it stands without Maqqeph, and with *Tifcha*, but תַּחַת with *Mercha*, and the first letter of this word with Dagesh.

[1] Of cognate origin perhaps is the Arab. *nuḳba* (explained in Zamachśari, *Moḳaddima*, Wetstein's edition, p. 62, by the Persian *mijân-bend*, a waist-belt), a kind of apron fastened by means of a drawing-string, according to the Turkish Kâmûs.—*Fl.*

[2] In Arabia the application of the *kej* by means of a red-hot piece of iron (*mikwâh*) plays an important part in the medical treatment of man and beast. One sees many people who have been burned, not merely on the legs and arms, but also on the face; and the most beautiful horses are generally disfigured by the *kej*.

The form of the word is like אִי, עִי, צִי, רִי, Job xxxvii. 11; along with רִי, Simson ha-Nakdan also compares נִי in Ezek. xxvii. 32. The inverted arrangement of the words in the last of the five clauses is very effective. In the fivefold exchange, shame and sadness take the place of the haughty rejoicing of luxury.

The prophet now, by a sudden transition, directly addresses the people of Jerusalem; for the "daughters of Zion" are the daughter Zion in her present degenerate state. The daughter Zion loses her sons; the daughters of Zion thereby lose their husbands. Ver. 25: "*Thy men will fall by the sword, and thy heroism in the war.*" The plural מְתִים (the singular of which—in Ethiopic, *met*, "man" in the sense of husband, the Latin *maritus*—is still found only in the form מָתוּ, with the union-vowel *û*, as a constituent part of proper names) is a prose-word in the Pentateuch, especially Deuteronomy; elsewhere it is a poetic archaism. מְתֵיךְ is changed for גְּבוּרָתֵךְ, "thy heroic power," an abstract expression meaning the inhabitants of the city, in the same way as *robur* and *robora* are also used in Latin (probably in like manner Jer. xlix. 35).

What the prophet here predicts for the daughter Zion he sees in ver. 26 as fulfilled on her: "*Then will her gates lament and mourn; and she is made desolate, sits down on the earth.*" The gates where the husbands of the daughter of Zion, now fallen in the war, used at one time to assemble in such numbers, have been deserted, and in this condition one as it were hears them complain and sees them mourn (xiv. 31; Jer. xiv. 2; Lam. i. 4); and the daughter Zion herself is quite vacated, thoroughly emptied, utterly stripped of her former population. In this state of saddest widowhood, or bereavement of her children, brought down from her former exalted position (xlvii. 8) and princely adornment (Jer. xiii. 18), she sits on the ground in the manner shown on Roman commemorative medals, struck after the destruction of Jerusalem, which represented Judea as a woman utterly crushed and in despair, sitting under a palm-tree before a warrior standing erect, while there is inscribed at the side, *Judaea capta* (or *devicta*). The LXX. translates in accordance with the general sense, *καὶ καταλειφθήσῃ μόνη καὶ εἰς*

τὴν γῆν ἐδαφισθήσῃ (cf. Luke xix. 14),—only תֵּשֵׁב is not the second, but the third person, as also נִקְּתָה is third person perfect Niphal (for נִקְּתָה), a pausal form, such as is often found also with smaller distinctive accents than Silluk and Athnach (here in connection with *Tifcha*, as also in v. 9, xxii. 14; 1 Kings v. 31; Amos iii. 8). The clause לָאָרֶץ תֵּשֵׁב follows without any connecting particle, as is pretty frequently the case when one of the two verbs stands in relation to the other as a closer specification which would otherwise be expressed adverbially, as for instance in 1 Chron. xiii. 2, and with inverted arrangement of the words, Jer. iv. 5; cf. xii. 6: in her depopulated and therefore isolated condition, or her deprivation also of even the most necessary articles of household furniture (cf. xlvii. 1, 5, and the Talmudic נקי מנכסיו, "robbed of his property"), Zion sits on the earth.

When war shall have thus unsparingly swept away the men of Zion, then will arise an unnatural state of things: women will not be sought by men, but men by women. Chap. iv. 1: "*And seven women shall lay hold of one man on that day, saying, Our own bread will we eat, and in our own garments will we clothe ourselves; only let thy name be named upon us, take away our reproach.*" The division of the chapters is wrong, for this verse is the closing one of the prophecy against the women, and the concluding portion of the whole discourse only begins with iv. 2. The present pride of the daughters of Zion, every one of whom deems herself the greatest, as the wife of so-and-so, and whom many men now woo, comes to an end with the self-humiliating fact that seven of them offer themselves to one man,—any one,—and that, too, with a renunciation of the claim, legally resting on the husband, for food and clothing (Ex. xxi. 10). It is enough for them to be allowed to bear his name (עַל is employed, as in lxiii. 19: the name is put upon what is named, because giving it its definiteness and its character); he is to take away their reproach merely by letting them be called his wives (viz. the reproach of being unmarried, liv. 4, as in Gen. xxx. 23 the reproach was that of being childless). Grotius appropriately compares Lucan (*Pharsalia*, ii. 342): *Da tantum nomen inane connubii, liceat tumulo scripsisse Catonis Marcia.* The number seven (seven women to one man) is explained by

the fact that there is an evil seven as well as a sacred seven (for example, Matt. xii. 45).

With iv. 1 ends the threatenings addressed to the women of Jerusalem. It is the side-piece which accompanies the threatenings against the rulers of the nation. Both scenes of judgment are but parts of the picture showing the doom about to fall on Jerusalem and Judah as a State or commonwealth. And even this again is but a part, namely, the central group in the picture of a much more comprehensive judgment about to fall on everything lofty and exalted on the earth. Jerusalem is thus the centre and focus of the great judgment-day for the world. In Jerusalem there is concentrated the ungodly glory now ripe for judgment; here, too, will concentrate the light of the true glory in the latter days. To this promise, with which the discourse returns to its starting-point, the prophet now passes directly. But indeed no transition-stage is needed; for the judgment in itself is the medium of salvation. Jerusalem is sifted by being judged; and by being sifted it is delivered, pardoned, glorified. In this sense the prophet proceeds, with the words "on that day," to describe the one great day of God at the end of time (not a day of twenty-four hours any more than the seven days of creation) in its leading features, as beginning with judgment but bringing deliverance. Ver. 2: "*On that day will the sprout of Jehovah become an ornament and glory, and the fruit of the earth pride and splendour for the saved ones of Israel.*" The four terms signifying glory, here combined in pairs, confirm us in the expectation that after the mass of Israel have been swept away together with the objects of their worthless pride, mention will be made of what will become an object of well-grounded pride for the "escaped of Israel" (*i.e.* those who have escaped destruction, the remnant that has survived the judgment). According to this interpretation of what is promised, it is impossible that it can be the Church of the future itself that is called "the sprout of Jehovah" and "the fruit of the earth" (the opinion of Luzzatto, Malbim, and Reuss); moreover, considering the contrast drawn between what is promised and what is set aside, it is improbable that צֶמַח יְהוָה and פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ (not "fruit of the ground," פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה) mean the blessing of harvest bestowed by Jehovah, the rich produce of

the land. For though "the sprout of Jehovah" may possibly signify this (Gen. xix. 25; Ps. civ. 14), and though fertility of the land is a permanent feature in the promise regarding the latter days (as seen in xxx. 23 ff.; Zech. ix. 16 f.; cf. the close of Joel and Amos, also the end of Hos. ii.), while it is also said that the fruitful fields of Israel will become famous in the eyes of the nations (Ezek. xxxiv. 29; Mal. iii. 12; cf. Joel ii. 17), yet this earthly, material good, of which, moreover, there was no lack during the times of Uzziah and Jotham, was wholly unsuited for forming a contrast that would quite outshine the worldly glory hitherto prevailing. Even after granting what Hofmann says, "that the blessing which comes from the fields, as the natural gift of God, may form a contrast with the studied works of art and articles imported from abroad of which men had hitherto been proud," yet what Rosenmüller had previously remarked remains true, "that the grandeur of the whole discourse is opposed to this interpretation." Let any one but compare xxviii. 5, where Jehovah Himself is in like manner called the glory and ornament of the remnant of Israel. But if צֶמַח יְהוָה is neither the delivered remnant itself, nor the fruit of the field which Jehovah causes to sprout, it will be the name of the Messiah: such is the view given in the Targum, and such also is the opinion, among modern commentators, of Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Steudel, Umbreit, Caspari, Drechsler, Strachey, and de Lagarde.[1] The great King coming in the future is called צֶמַח (*ἀνατολή* in the sense of Heb. vii. 14), as a Sprout arising from soil which is at once earthly, human, and Davidic,—a Sprout that Jehovah has planted in the earth, and causes to burst through and sprout up as the pride of His congregation, which was waiting for this heavenly Child. In the parallel member of the verse, this Child is likewise called פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ, as the fruit which the land will bring forth,—just as Zedekiah is called זֶרַע הָאָרֶץ in Ezek. xvii. 5, because the same reasons

[1] In his *Semitica* (i. 178) on this passage, this writer explains צמח יהוה as *αὐτομάτως φυέν* and *ἄνωθεν δεδωρημένον*, so that, taken in conjunction with Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15, it points to a descendant of the house of David whom Jehovah causes to be born in a time of darkness and distress, in contrast with the natural descendant that had become utterly useless and worthless.

for which צֶמַח יְהוָה cannot mean the blessing of the fields apply with like force to פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ, instead of which there would be used the expression פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה, if the produce of agriculture were intended,—for whenever the former expression occurs instead of the latter, there is always a probable reason for the choice, as in Num. xiii. 20, 26; Deut. i. 25; cf. Lev. xxv. 18 f. Here, however, it was necessary to say "the fruit of the ground" in order to make clear the meaning of the expression "the sprout of Jehovah," for it is self-evident that אֲדָמָה means the land of Israel. In this way therefore will the Messiah be the "fruit of the earth" as the noblest fruit of the land in the future,—fruit in which all growth and bloom in the history of Israel reaches the end that has been promised and appointed of God.

Without importing New Testament ideas into the passage, we may nevertheless account for this double designation of the Coming One merely on the ground of the endeavour to describe the twofold aspect of His origin: on the one side, He comes from Jehovah, and yet on the other side He is also of earthly origin, by His going forth from Israel. We have here the passage on the basis of which צֶמַח has come to be adopted in Jeremiah (xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15) and Zechariah (iii. 8, vi. 12) as a proper name of the Messiah. There is much that commends itself, however, in Bredenkamp's interpretation: "The prophet here depicts the circle of light forming part of the future glory, but not its centre. The Sprout of Jehovah—an expression which points to the silent and mysterious power of creative grace—and the fruit of blessing with which the land is clothed, is the same as is called in Hos. iii. 5, 'the goodness of Jehovah,' the good things of the last days, which, as the gift of God, will present themselves on the ruins of the glory that has passed away." Nägelsbach also understands what is promised in the sense of the declaration in lxi. 11.

Connecting itself with the expression פְּלֵיטַת יִשְׂרָאֵל in ver. 2, ver. 3 goes on to describe the Church of the future: "*And it shall come to pass, whoever is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem,—holy will he be called, every one who is written down for life in Jerusalem.*" The keynote of the whole verse is given by the word "holy." Whereas formerly, in Jerusalem, persons were distinguished according to their

rank and their fortune, without regard to their moral worth (iii. 1–3, 10 f.; cf. xxxii. 5), "holy" will then be the one chief name of honour befitting every individual, inasmuch as the national vocation of Israel (Ex. xix. 6, etc.) would now be realized in every one. Hence the expression "he shall be called" is not, of course, equivalent to "he shall be," but it presupposes this, as in i. 26, lxi. 6, lxii. 4. "Holy" (קָדוֹשׁ) means what is separated from the world and superior to it; the congregation of the saints, or holy ones, who now inhabit Jerusalem, are what remain after a smelting; their holiness is the consequence of a washing. The term הַנִּשְׁאָר is interchanged with הַנּוֹתָר: the former word contains the idea of intention as a part of its meaning, and thus signifies what has been purposely left behind; the latter points more to the simple fact, and signifies what remains over or is left. The latter part of ver. 3 declares the character and the numbers of those who will constitute this "remnant of grace." This apposition-clause means something more than those who are entered as living in Jerusalem; for כָּתַב לְ signifies not merely "to inscribe as" something, but (like כָּתַב with the accusative, Jer. xxii. 30) "to inscribe as destined for" something. Whether we translate לַחַיִּים "for life" (as in Dan. xii. 2), or—a less probable meaning, however, as the form is not לְחַיִּים—"for living ones" (cf. Ps. lxix. 29; 1 Sam. xxv. 29), there is always contained in the expression הַכָּתוּב לְ the idea of predestination, the presupposition of a divine "Book of life" (Ex. xxxii. 32 f.; Dan. xii. 1; cf. Ps. cxxxix. 16; Rev. xx. 12, etc.), and thus a meaning like that which is contained in the words of Acts xiii. 48, *ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. The reference is to persons who, on account of the good kernel of faith which is in them, have their names standing in the book of life as those who are to be partakers of the life in the New Jerusalem, and who, in accordance with this divine purpose of grace, have been spared amidst the sifting judgment. For it is only by passing through the judgment, which sets free this kernel of faith, that such a holy community can be formed.

Whether ver. 4 belongs to ver. 3 and specifies the condition and the time of the fulfilment of what is there indicated, is a question as difficult to decide as the similar case in

Ps. lxiii. 7*a*. It seems more likely and natural, however, that ver. 4 is a hypothetical protasis to ver. 5: the combination of clauses will then be like what is found in 2 Sam. xv. 33 f.: "*When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughter of Zion and purged away the blood-guiltiness of Jerusalem from the midst of her, by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of sifting; then Jehovah creates*" . . . Here, as in xxiv. 13, אִם followed by a preterite forms the *futurum exactum* (Gesen. § 106. 3*c*), and introduces that through the preceding occurrence of which the other is conditioned. The imperfect יָרַיח (Hiphil, to wash or rinse away, as in 2 Chron. iv. 6; Ezek. xl. 38, to rinse off; from רוּחַ, to push away) likewise obtains the meaning of a *futurum exactum* through the preterite רָחַץ (cf. the very same consecution of tenses in vi. 11). The double purification corresponds to the two scenes of judgment described in chap. iii. The filth of the women of Zion is the moral pollution hidden under their showy and coquettish finery; and the bloody deeds of Jerusalem are the judicial murders committed by its rulers on the poor and innocent. This filth and these spots of blood the Sovereign Ruler washes and purges away (see 2 Chron. iv. 6) by the pouring out of His Spirit or breath (xxx. 28) over the men and women dwelling in Jerusalem. This breath is called רוּחַ מִשְׁפָּט, inasmuch as it punishes what is evil, and רוּחַ בָּעַר, inasmuch as it sweeps it away or removes it. בָּעַר is to be explained, as in vi. 13, in the same way as in Deut. xiii. 6, etc.; cf. especially xix. 13, xxi. 9. The rendering of the LXX. (which is followed by the Vulgate), ἐν πνεύματι καύσεως, is based on another meaning of the verb, which not merely signifies to cut away, sweep away, depasture (iii. 14, v. 5, etc.), but also to burn, consume by fire (xliv. 15, etc.). The "spirit" is in both cases the Spirit of God, which pervades and works throughout the world, not merely giving and sustaining life, but also destroying and sifting, as seems good (xxx. 22 f.); and such is the case before us.

In ver. 5, the imperishable glory is described as breaking forth: "*And Jehovah creates over every spot of Mount Zion, and over her festal gatherings, a cloud by day, and smoke, and the brightness of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory*

comes a canopy." As the Israelites who had been redeemed from Egypt were led and screened by Jehovah through the day in a smoke-cloud and through the night in a fire-cloud, which moved before them in the form of a pillar and floated over them as a roof (Num. xiv. 14, etc.), — the continued manifestation of His self-revelation at Sinai, — so will He also shield the Israelites of the final redemption-days, who, because they have no longer to wander, no longer need the pillar of cloud, but only the roof of cloud. Such a cloud-roof Jehovah will create, as the "consecutive perfect" וּבָרָא declares. The verb בָּרָא (for the pre-exilian use of which, in the sense of "creating," we have vouchers in such passages as Ex. xxxiv. 10; Num. xvi. 30; Amos iv. 13; Deut. iv. 32) always indicates a miraculous divine production having a beginning in time, for even when God does anything natural, such action is in itself always supernatural; here, however, the reference is to a new manifestation of His gracious presence, in a sphere exalted above the present course of nature and the world. This manifestation takes the form, by day (Cheyne thinks that יוֹמָם has by an oversight been taken from ver. 5), of a cloud, and this too (as is designedly made prominent by the hendiadys עָנָן וְעָשָׁן, viz. cloud as regards form, and smoke as regards substance) in a cloud of smoke (not a watery cloud, like those which naturally cover the sky), and by night in a fiery splendour, and this, too, not a calm brightness resembling fire, like that of the sunset, but, as shown by לְהַבָה, which here follows (as in Lam. ii. 3; Ps. cv. 32), a brilliantly flaming and therefore a real and living fire. The purpose of the cloud is not merely to afford a shade, but also to serve as a protecting wall (see Ex. xiv. 19) to withstand opposing influences; and the fire is not merely for the purpose of giving light, but also by flaming and sparkling to ward off hostile forces. But the cloud and fire are above all meant to serve as a token of the near presence of God and of His goodwill. In the most glorious times of the temple, a smoke-cloud of this kind filled the Holy of Holies, and only once (namely at the dedication of Solomon's temple, 1 Kings viii. 10) the whole building; but now the cloud, whose smoke, moreover, still changes into flaming fire by night, spreads over every spot

(מָכוֹן used as the more poetic word instead of מָקוֹם) of Mount Zion and Zion's festal gatherings. The whole mountain has thus become a Most Holy Place, and is holy, not merely to the extent of its being the dwelling-place of Jehovah, but wholly sacred as the meeting-place of a congregation of the saints. The word מִקְרָאֶיהָ, or according to another mode of writing, מִקְרָאֶהָ (a defective plural form, as in Jer. xix. 8), refers to Zion. There is no need for taking this noun (as is done by Gesenius, Meier, Hitzig, Ewald, Luzzatto) in the sense of "meeting-halls"—a meaning which it has nowhere else; it may, however, also signify (as in i. 13) the meetings or assemblies (*ἐκκλησίαι*).

Though ambiguity rests on the explanatory clause כִּי עַל־כָּל־כָּבוֹד חֻפָּה, this is no reason for holding (as Cheyne does) that the text has been mutilated; rather may we suppose these words, as a general statement, to be a gloss. Schegg and others regard the clause in this way, as a *locus communis*, and render it: "because, for everything glorious, protection and covering are seemly;" and certainly חפה bears the meaning of covering and concealing generally. As a noun, חֻפָּה in Ps. xix. 6, Joel ii. 16, does not signify, as in post-Biblical Hebrew, the nuptial canopy, but the bridal chamber. from its being concealed. But the verb-forms חָפָה, נֶחְפָּה also signify to cover, to clothe for adornment; and in this way the חֻפָּה here will also serve, not merely for a guard or protection, but also as an honour to the object covered. A cloud of smoke and a blaze of fire floats over Mount Zion like a canopy. (It is thus unnecessary to take חֻפָּה as the 3rd pers. Pual, inasmuch as תִּהְיֶה, which immediately follows in ver. 6, readily suggests itself as a word to be supplied.) The only question is whether כָּל־כָּבוֹד means "every glory," or, as in Ps. xxxix. 6, xlv. 14, "pure glory, nothing but glory." There is much that commends itself in the view of Hofmann, that Jerusalem is now all glory, as its inhabitants are all holiness, and that therefore this screen is spread out over pure glory; nevertheless we prefer the former view, as more in accord with the noun-clause. The glory of which Zion has now become a partaker no longer suffers any decay; Jehovah acknowledges it by tokens of His gracious presence, for there will henceforth be nothing glorious in Zion over which,

in the way indicated, there will not be a canopy to afford shade and light, to cover, protect, and adorn.

In this way, Zion becomes a safe retreat and shelter against all adversities and misfortunes. Ver. 6: "*And there will be a booth for a shade by day from the heat of the sun, and a refuge and hiding-place from storm and from rain.*" Just as in this passage, the place of concealment and safety is also called סֻכָּה in Ps. xxxi. 21, lxxvii. 5. The subject of the verb תִּהְיֶה is not the miraculous roofing, for עָנָן (cloud) is masculine; and to say of a חֻפָּה (canopy) that it will be a סֻכָּה (booth) is absurd. But תִּהְיֶה is either used in a pregnant sense (as in xv. 6, xxiii. 13), so as to mean "and there will be a booth;" or "Zion" in ver. 5 is the subject. Considering that "Zion" is so far away, we prefer the former alternative; the preservation naturally applies to the dwellers in Zion. Hitzig, with whom Nägelsbach agrees, thinks the end of ver. 5 should be read in undivided connection with ver. 6 ("for over everything glorious will arise a canopy and a booth for a shade by day," *i.e.* serving as such, etc.). But the combination of the synonymous terms חֻפָּה וְסֻכָּה is not in Isaiah's style, and the preservation from the glowing heat of the sun does not properly accord with the inanimate object כָּל־כָּבוֹד. With מַחְסֶה (*i.e.* not מַחֲסֶה) from חָסָה, which is allied to חוּשׁ (cf. the Assyrian *ḫasû* and *ḫâšu*), "to flee for refuge,"[1] מִסְתּוֹר is combined (only here in the Old Testament), for the sake of alliteration, instead of סֵתֶר, which is more frequently used by the prophets in other passages, as xxviii. 17, xxxii. 2. The temporal adjunct יוֹמָם, "by day" (which stands in construction with לְצֵל; cf. Ezek. xxx. 16), is purposely left without a corresponding לַיְלָה, "by night," because what is meant is a place of safety and concealment at all times, whether by night or by day. Instead of speci-

[1] This word is shown by the sound of its initial letter (*ḫ* not *ḥ*) to be different from the Arab. حسى, from which comes ماء الحسى, the water that is preserved under or by means of a covering of sand, or by means of the rock below, from evaporating or oozing away. In a biography of Mohammed (MSS. in the Royal Library at Berlin, *Sect. Wetzst.* ii. Nr. 311), it is said in the section on the battle at Mûta: "الحسى (*ḥisâ* or *ḥasâ*) is a sandy spot under which there is a rocky bottom; if rain falls upon this sand, the water dries up, but the rock prevents it from running

fying the most manifold dangers, the burning heat of the sun, storm, and rain are mentioned as examples; but it is a striking fact that the rain, which certainly is a benefit earnestly desired by one in a state of חֹרֶב, *i.e.* drought and burning heat, is also mentioned. At the present day, when rain falls in Jerusalem, the whole city leaps for joy. But the effects of rain, especially of the winter rain which suddenly pours down, are certainly very often destructive. The Jerusalem of the latter days is like Paradise restored (Gen. ii. 5 f.); one will not then be any longer exposed to the destructive changes of the weather. In this way the end of this prophetic address runs into the beginning. This Mount Zion, roofed over with a cloud of smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night, is no other than the mountain of the house of Jehovah, which is exalted above all mountains, and to which the nations make their pilgrimage; and this Jerusalem, which is holy within and all-glorious without, is no other than the place from which one day the word of Jehovah will go out into all the world. But what kind of Jerusalem is that? Is it the Jerusalem which is to see the glorious days of the people of God in this present life (Rev. xii.), or is it the Jerusalem of the new heavens and the new earth (Rev. xx.)? The proper answer is, Both in one. In the vision of the prophet, the Jerusalem of the latter days on earth and Jerusalem of the life beyond—the glorified Jerusalem of earth and the glorified Jerusalem of heaven—are fused together as one. For it is a characteristic of the Old Testament that it views the closing period of the present life and the eternity that lies beyond as forming one continuous line, and looks upon the whole as if its character were that of earth. The first cross-line was drawn by the New Testament.

away, and the sand keeps the heat of the sun from drying it up; if any one therefore digs under this sand, he finds water." According to this, it might appear that חָסָה originally means to "hide one's self." But the proper signification of the old Arabic حسى يحسى is to draw out (water), to exhaust, empty, and, metaphorically, to find out something secret, to draw secret thoughts out of any one by questions, etc. The water of a حسى is gradually taken out from under the sand, hence the name.

The Judgment of Devastation upon Jehovah's Vineyard, Chap. V.

Concluding Discourse of the First Cycle of Prophecy.

The foregoing discourse, at the close of chap. iv., has run through all the phases of prophetic address; and it has so completely worked out its fundamental thought,—the overthrow of the false glory and the establishment of the true glory of Israel, which is realized through judgment,—that chap. v. cannot be regarded either as a continuation or as a completion of it. Unquestionably chap. v. contains various allusions to chap. ii.–iv. The parable of the Vineyard in chap. v. 1–7 grows as it were out of chap. iii. 14; and in chap. v. 15 the recurrent verse or refrain of chap. ii. 9 is repeated, but varied in a similar manner as in chap. ii. 17. Yet these and other points of contact with chap. ii.–iv. do not prove that chap. v. was not independent, but only that the two were written about the same time. The contemporary circumstances or situation of the two discourses is the same; and the range of the prophet's thought from its relation to his surroundings at the time, is therefore closely related. Nevertheless the fundamental thought which is carried out in chap. v. is an entirely different one. The basis of the discourse is constituted by a parable of Israel as the Vineyard of Jehovah, which, contrary to all expectation, was bringing forth bad fruit, and therefore was given up to devastation. What sort of bad fruit this was, is described in a sixfold woe; and what kind of devastation it was to be, is told in the gloomy night-like close of the discourse, which is wholly without a promise.

The prophet began the first discourse in chap. i. like another Moses, and the second not less intensely with the text of an older prophecy; and now he begins this third discourse like a player who has a crowd of people around him, and who with alluring words addresses and rouses up himself and his hearers. Ver. 1*a*: *"Come, I will sing of my beloved, a song of my dearest about his vineyard!"* The winged rhythm, the musical euphony, and the graceful assonances of this invocation are inimitable and cannot be reproduced in a translation. The ל of לִידִידִי and לְכַרְמוֹ

indicates the reference: the song refers to his Beloved; it is a song of his dearest one himself about his vineyard (not of his cousin, *patruelis*, as Luther, following Jerome, translates it, for דוד signifies *patruus*, uncle, but here the meaning is determined by יָדִיד *ἀγαπητός*). The song of the beloved one is more definitely designated a song of the beloved one himself; it is not a song composed about him or composed for him, but a song as he himself has sung it and has to sing it. Knabenbauer rightly says: "The prophet recites it out of the thoughts of God." Cheyne, with Lowth, conjectures the reading שירת דודים; but this is not appropriate, for it is not a "love-song." The little song is short, and runs thus, 1*b*–2: "*My Beloved had a vineyard on a fatly nourished mount. And he dug it up and cleared it of stones, and planted it with noble vines, and built a tower in it, and also hewed out a wine-press therein, and he hoped for grape-bringing, but it brought wildings.*" The vineyard כֶּרֶם (originally meaning hill, like the Assyrian *karmu*, cf. Talm. כָּרַם, to heap, to heap up[1]) lay upon a קֶרֶן, *i.e.* a mountain peak projecting like a horn, and consequently open to the sunshine on all sides; for "apertos Bacchus amat colles," as Virgil says (*Georg.* ii. 113). This mountain-horn or peak was בֶּן־שֶׁמֶן, a child of fatness; fatness was innate in it, it belonged to it by nature. שֶׁמֶן, as in chap. xxviii. 1, is used to indicate the richness of a soil capable of cultivation. On this vineyard the possessor bestowed all possible trouble and care. On account of the steep side of the mountain, the plough could not be used; and therefore he dug it up, *i.e.* the soil, which was to become the vineyard, with a hoe (עָזַק, to hoe, *i.e.* with the hoe; Arab. *mi'zak*, *mi'zaka*, to hand hoe in order to make fertile; Mishn., to draw a trench around something, whether a plant or a place, which is followed by the LXX., cf. Mark xii. 1: *καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα*, see Kimchi's Dict. under עזק). And as he found it covered over with stones and *débris*, he proceeded to get rid of this rubbish by throwing it out (סָקַל, privative Pi.; lit. taking to do with stones, to clear of stones, like مرض, removing sickness, healing, cf. casting the skin, scaling off, and such like).

[1] The Gemara, *Shabbath* 88*b*, says of the verb כרם: "it has the sense of heaping, gathering" (לישנא דמכנש הוא).

After the soil had been brought under cultivation, he planted it with שֹׂרֵק, the finest kind of eastern vine with bright-red grapes; for it is a colour word, not (like the Arab. name of wine, *ez-zerḳâ*, the bright-blue, the bright) indicating the colour of the drink, but that of the grapes (שָׂרַק = שָׁרַק, to be suffused with red, *i.e.* to be dark red, different from שָׁקַר, signifying to be light red). Then, in order to protect and adorn the vineyard, planted at such cost, he built in the midst of it a tower. וְגַם sets prominently forth that he also hewed out a wine-press trough in it (יֶקֶב, the trough into which runs the must pressed out in the wine-press גַּת, *lacus* in distinction from *torcular*); using a rocky portion of the soil in order that the trough may be the more immoveable and lasting. חָצַב בּוֹ has not the accent retracted, as *e.g.* אֹהֵב דַּעַת, Prov. xii. 1, xvii. 19, and חָפַן בִּי, Ps. xviii. 20, because a *Beth* would thereby easily become inaudible, and hence there is also more firmness given to חצב by the pronunciation חָצַב; and in like manner in chap. x. 15 we have הַחֹצֵב בּוֹ and בְּכָחַךְ for בְּכֹחַךְ, chap. xi. 14; cf. Comm. on Ps. cxxxii. 10. This was a difficult piece of work, as the וגם gives us to understand; it was difficult, and for that reason gave evidence of surest expectation. But how utterly was this deceived! The vineyard brought forth no such fruit as is expected from a sorek-planting; it brought forth no עֲנָבִים at all, *i.e.* no berries or clusters such as a cultivated vine bears, but it brought בְּאֻשִׁים, wildings. Luther at first translated this word as wild grapes, and latterly as harsh or sour grapes; but they come to the same thing. The wild and the noble vine are only qualitatively different; the *vitis vinifera* is, like all cultivated plants, assigned to human nurture, under which it becomes ennobled, whereas growing in its wild state it falls short of its destination. Hence בְּאֻשִׁים designates the small sour berries of the wild vine (Rashi: *lambruches, i.e.* berries of the *labrusca*), as well as those berries of the noble vine which have remained unripe and stunted (but which are not like בֹּסֶר, which are only not yet ripe).[1] Such berries as these were brought forth

[1] In the Jerusalem Talmud such stunted berries are called אוּבְשִׁין; and in the Mishna (*Ma'aseroth* i. 2, *Shebîith* iv. 8), הֶבְאִישׁ is the word used regularly of grapes that have become half-ripe.

by that vineyard; they were such as are produced by the wild vine, but not such as are to be expected from the most carefully cultivated vines of the noblest sort.

The Song of the Beloved One, so sorely deceived, thus ends. The prophet recites it, and not his dearest one himself; but because the two are one heart and one soul the prophet can continue thus in vers. 3 and 4: "*And now, ye inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, between me and my Vineyard! What was there further to do for my Vineyard which I did not do for it? Why hoped I for the bringing of grapes, and it brought wildings?*" The person of the Beloved may already be discerned, from the fact that the prophet speaks as if he were the beloved himself. The Beloved of the prophet and Lover of the prophet, יָדִיד and דּוֹד, is Jehovah, with whom he is so united through a *unio mystica*, elevated above earthly love, that, like the Angel of Jehovah in the primeval histories, he can speak as if he were Jehovah Himself (see especially Zech. ii. 12–15). To one who has insight, the parabolical meaning and purpose of the song, therefore, betrays itself already here; and even the inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah (יוֹשֵׁב and אִישׁ, taken collectively, as in chap. viii. 14, ix. 8, xxii. 21, cf. xx. 6), who are appealed to as adjudicators or umpires, are not so utterly stupefied by sin that they should not perceive at what the prophet was aiming. They are called upon to decide on which side the guilt of this unnatural issue lies, of this עֲשׂוֹת of the Vineyard, so contradictory to the עֲשׂוֹת of the Lord: that instead of the bringing of grapes, which was hoped for, it has brought wildings. On מַה־לַּעֲשׂוֹת, *quid faciendum est?* see Comm. on Hab. i. 17; Ges. § 132. 1. Instead of (לָמָּה) לָמָּה, we have the more appropriate מִדּוּעַ; for the latter asks for the *causa efficiens*, or the cause, whereas the former asks for the *causa finalis*, or the purpose. The parallel passage in chap. l. 2 resembles this passage, both in the use of the מדוע, and also in the fact that there, as well as here, it relates to both clauses, and especially to the latter of the two. This paratactical construction is also found in the case of other conjunctions, as in chap. xii. 1, lxv. 12. They are called upon to decide and answer as to this *what* and *wherefore;* but they are silent, just because they clearly see that they would have to

condemn themselves (as David similarly condemned himself on the occasion of Nathan's parable, 2 Sam. xii. 5). The Lord of the vineyard, therefore, again proceeds to speak. He, its accuser, will now also be its judge.—Ver. 5: "*Now then, I will let you know what I will forthwith do to my vineyard: take away its hedge, and it shall be for grazing; pull down its wall, and it shall be for trampling upon.*" Before וְעַתָּה, as in chap. iii. 14, we must imagine a pause; the Lord of the vineyard breaks the silence of the umpires, which betrays their consciousness of guilt. They shall hear, then, from Him what He is going to do to His vineyard (ל in לְכַרְמִי, as, for example, in Deut. xi. 6). אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה, *fut. instans*, equivalent to *facturus sum* (Ges. § 134. 2 *b*). In the following *inf. abs.* the content of the אֵת אֲשֶׁר, *id quod*, is unfolded. On this explicative use of the *inf. abs.*, see chap. xx. 2, lviii. 6, 7; in such cases it represents the place of the object, as elsewhere of the subject, but always in an abrupt, stiff manner. He will take away the מְשׂוּכָּה, *i.c.* the green thorny hedge (Prov. xv. 19; Hos. ii. 8 = מְסוּכָּה, Micah vii. 4 fr. שָׂכַךְ = שׂוּךְ, סוּךְ, סוּג, to hedge round), with which the vineyard is enclosed, and will pull down the גָּדֵר, *i.e.* the low stone wall (Num. xxii. 24; Prov. xxiv. 31; cf. Ezra ix. 9 ending, according to Cheyne, in allusion to Isaiah's parable), which had been surrounded by the hedge of thorn-bushes to make a better defence, as well as for the protection of the wall itself, more especially against undermining, so that the vineyard, in consequence of this, is exposed to grazing and trampling down (LXX. *καταπάτημα*), *i.e.* becomes an open way and resort for men and beasts.

Thus the unthankful vineyard comes to an end, and indeed to a hopeless end. Ver. 6: "*And I will utterly ruin it: it shall not be pruned, and it shall not be hoed, and it shall shoot up in thorns and thistles; and I will command the clouds not to rain rain over it.*" בַּתָּה = בָּתַת fr. בּוּת = בָּתַת (بَتَّ, akin to בָּתַר, بَتَرَ), *abscindere*, signifies the sharply cutting off, and, as the action is viewed as a quality: what is sharply cut off, *abscissum præruptum*, vii. 19, or it is also transferred to the result of the action: the sudden total destruction.[1] This is the

[1] In the Arabic, اَلْبَتَّةَ, *elbatta* (Vulg. *halbatt*), from the meaning ἀποτόμως (absolutely), comes to be commonly used for "surely."

meaning here, where שִׂית בָּתָה is a more refined expression for the more usual עָשָׂה כָלָה, both being construed with the accusative of the thing which is brought to a total end. Further, pruning (זמר) and hoeing (עדר, different from another עדר, to put in order, 2 Chron. xii. 33, 38) with the weeding-hoe (מַעְדֵּר, vii. 25), would not improve it, but only bring new disappointments: it is the will of the Lord, therefore, that the deceitful vineyard shall shoot up thorns and thistles (עָלָה is applied to the soil, as in chap. xxxiv. 13 and Prov. xxiv. 31; cf. צָמַה, Eccles. ii. 6, with acc. of the object, according to Ges. § 138, 1, 2, applied here to the exclusively and peculiarly Isaianic וְשַׁמִּיר שָׁיַת). And in order that it may remain a wilderness, the clouds receive commandment from the Lord not to rain upon it. There can now be no longer any doubt who the Lord of the vineyard is. He is the Lord who gives commands to clouds (cf. Gen. ii. 16), or in respect to the clouds (cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 8, according to the old interpretation, to the angels), and therefore the Lord of heaven and of earth. It is He who is the prophet's Beloved and dearest One. The song which opened in so loving and harmless a tone, has now become sharply severe, and terribly repulsive. The husk of the parable, which has already been broken through, now falls completely off (cf. Matt. xxii. 13, xxv. 30). What it sets forth in symbol is true. This truth the prophet establishes by an open declaration in ver. 7: "*For the vineyard of Jehovah of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah are the plantation of His delight; he waited for justice, and behold rapine; for righteousness, and behold an outery.*" The conception is not that the Lord of the vineyard lets no more rain fall upon it, for this Lord is Jehovah (which is not indeed said in what follows כִּי); but more generally: this is how it stands with the vineyard, for all Israel, and especially the people of Judah, is this vineyard, which so bitterly deceived the expectations of its Lord, and, moreover, it is the vineyard of Jehovah of hosts, and therefore of the omnipotent God, whom even the clouds must serve when He punishes. The כִּי justifies, as in Job vi. 21, not only the truth of what was last stated, but the truth of the whole simile, including this; it is כי, *explic.*, which opens the *epimythion*. "The vineyard of the Lord of hosts"

(כֶּרֶם ה' צְבָאוֹת) is the predicate. "The house of Israel" (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל) is the whole nation, which is also symbolically represented in other passages under the same figure of a vineyard (chap. xxvii. 2 sqq.; Ps. lxxx., etc.). But because Isaiah is prophet in Judah, he applies the figure more particularly to Judah, which is called Jehovah's favourite plantation, inasmuch as it was the seat of the divine sanctuary and of the Davidic kingdom. נְטַע const. along with נֶטַע, like זֶרַע in Num. xi. 7, Ew. § 213*a*, and שְׁעֻשָׁעִים, an abstract *plural form*: the delighting, from the Pilpel, occurring in chap. xi. 8, in the sense of delightful playing, literally, stroking or caressing: Luther has *seine zarte Feser*, a term applied to the vine-shoot which is planted. This makes it easy enough to interpret the details of the simile. The fat mountain-peak is Canaan, flowing with milk and honey (Ex. xv. 17); the digging up of the vineyard, and clearing it of stones, is the clearing of Canaan from its former heathen inhabitants (Ps. xliv. 3); the sorek-vines are the holy priests and prophets and kings of Israel of the better early times (Jer. ii. 21); the protecting and ornamental tower in the midst of the vineyard is Jerusalem as the royal city, with Zion the royal fortress (Micah iv. 8); the winepress-trough is the temple, where, according to Ps. xxxvi. 9 (8), the wine of heavenly joy flows in streams, and by which, according to Ps. xlii. and many other passages, all the thirst of the soul is quenched. The grazing and trampling down are explained in Jer. v. 10 and xii. 10. The bitter deception experienced by Jehovah, is expressed in a play upon two words, indicating the surprising change of what was hoped for, into its opposite. The explanation which Gesenius, Caspari, Knobel, and others give of מִשְׂפָּח, as "shedding" = bloodshedding, does not commend itself; for even if ספח occurs once or twice in the Arabizing book of Job (chap. xxx. 7, xiv. 19) in the sense of *effundere*, like سفح, yet this verbal root is otherwise strange to the Hebrew (and the Aramæan). Moreover, מִשְׂפָּח in any case would only mean pouring out, or shedding, and not shedding of blood; and although the latter might indeed be possible in reference to the Arabic *saffâh*, *saffâk* (blood-shedder, blood-man), yet it would be an ellipsis such as cannot be substantiated anywhere

else in Hebrew usage. On the other hand, מִשְׁפָּה, rendered "leprosy," does not yield any appropriate sense, as (סַפַּחַת) מִסְפַּחַת is never generalized anywhere else into the general meaning of "dirt" (Luzzatto: *sozzura*), nor does it appear as an ethical conception. We therefore prefer to connect it with a meaning assuredly belonging to the verb כפח (see *Kal*, 1 Sam. ii. 36; *Niphal*, xiv. 1; *Hithpael*, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19), viz. "to associate or to join," of violent annexation, or from the root-conception of "snatching," and specifically "carrying forcibly away," etc.; cf. יָסַף, אָסַף, סוּף, סָפָה. Hence we regard the word as denoting the grasping appropriation and unjust heaping up of worldly possessions; certainly a suitable antithesis to מִשְׁפָּט, as צְעָקָה *vox oppressorum* (not *sanguinis*, which would be said) to צְדָקָה. The prophet depicts, in full-toned figures, how the expected noble grapes had turned into wild grapes, with nothing more than an outward resemblance to grapes. The introduction to the prophecy goes thus far.

The prophecy itself follows next, a sevenfold discourse composed of the sixfold woe contained in the following vers. 8–23, and the announcement of punishment in which it issues. In this sixfold woe the prophet describes the bad fruits individually. Confirming our explanation of מִשְׁפָּה, the first woe relates to *πλεονεξία*, covetousness and avarice, as the root of all evil.—Ver. 8: "*Woe unto those joining house to house, who lay field to field, till there is no more room, and ye are made to dwell alone within the land.*" נגע, as also קרב, is construed with ב in Judg. xix. 13 and Ps. xci. 10. The participle, because equivalent to a relative clause, is continued in the finite verb, as in ver. 23 and x. 1; the regular syntactical construction in cases of this kind (Ges. § 134. 2). The preterites after עַד (there being two such preterites, for אֶפֶס is an intensified אַיִן including the verbal idea) correspond to future perfects: they, the insatiable, rest not till, after all the smaller landed properties have been swallowed up by them, the whole land has become their possession, and no one besides themselves will be settled in the land (Job xxii. 8). Such covetousness was all the more condemnable, as the law of Israel had provided very stringently and carefully, that as far as possible there should be a proper proportional distribution of the ground and soil (Num. xxxiii. 54), and that hereditary

family property should be inalienable. The curse in Deut. xxvii. 17 was directed against the displacing of a boundary (in the language of the Roman law, *Crimen termini moti*). All landed property that had been alienated reverted to the family every fiftieth year, or year of jubilee; so that alienation had reference only to the usufruct of the land till that time. But how badly the law of the jubilee year was observed, may be inferred from Jer. xxxiv., according to which the law of the manumission of Hebrew bondsmen in the Sabbatical year had fallen entirely into neglect. The same complaint which Isaiah makes is brought forward by his contemporary Micah, in chap. ii. 2 (cf. Ps. xlix. 12; Job xxii. 8). The announcement of punishment is also there expressed in terms similar to what we have here in vers. 9 and 10: "*Into my ears Jehovah of hosts: Truly many houses shall become a desolation, large and beautiful ones without any inhabitants. For ten yokes of vineyard land will yield one pailful, and a quarter of seed corn will bring forth a bushel.*" How the prophet thinks of the nominal clause, Into my ears (or literally in my ears) is Jehovah - Zebaoth, is made clear from chap. xxii. 14: He is revealing Himself there to me. בְּאָזְנָי, pointed with Kamez along with Tifcha, as in that parallel passage, reminds us of what is to be interpolated in thought. In Hebrew, to say into the ears did not mean to speak secretly and softly; but, as Gen. xxiii. 10, 16, Job xxxiii. 8, and other passages show, it means to speak in a manner that is distinct and intelligible, and which excludes all misunderstanding. It is true that the prophet has not Jehovah now locally external to him, but he has Him notwithstanding objectively over against his own ego, and he is able to distinguish distinctly the thoughts and words of his own ego from the inspeaking of Jehovah which rises aloud within him. This inspoken word tells him how it will go with the rich insatiable landowners. אִם־לֹא introduces an oath of an affirmative sense (the complete form being חַי אֲנִי אִם־לֹא), just as אִם, *e.g.* Num. xiv. 23, introduces an oath of a negative sense. A universal desolation will ensue; רַבִּים signifies not less than all, for the houses (pronounced *bâttîm*) form altogether a great number (cf. רַבִּים, chap. ii. 3, and πολλοί, *e.g.* Matt. xx. 28). מֵאֵין is double, and is thus abso-

lutely negative (so that there is not no inhabitant). How such a desolation of the houses will come about, is explained by כִּי, beginning in ver. 10: failure of crops brings famine, and this brings depopulation of the country. Ten צֶמֶד (with *Dag. lene*, Ewald, § 212*b*) of vineyard land are ten pieces as large as can be ploughed daily with a yoke of oxen, as is shown by the analogous فدان (فدان), פְּדָנָן, which signifies the plough-span with belongings, and then the field, and particularly (in accordance with the Turkish Kamus) a cultivated field of the extent of 400 roods. On the assumption that vineyards, on account of their many curves, are difficult to calculate by yokes, and that they were never ploughed, Noskowyj (in his treatise, *De valle Hadhramaut*, 1866) understands the meaning to be ten pieces of yoke-like espaliers of vines trained on cross-laths (called *vina jugata* in Varro). But 1 Sam. xiv. 14 decides for *jugum* (*jugerum*) as a measure of land. כרמים is also applied to vineyards lying in the plain, and צמד may be a measure of corn-land transferred to vineyard land, which undoubtedly was not worked with the plough but with the hoe. Moreover, we want the intermediate links requisite to furnish the proof that the ancient Israelites had the same chief field-measure as the Romans.[1] Thus, then, ten days' work will only produce a single בַּת. This measure of liquids, which first appears in the time of the kings, was equivalent to אֵיפָה as a dry measure (Ezek. xlv. 11). According to Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 2. 9), it contained 72 Roman sextarii, or a little more than 33 Berlin quarts. The חֹמֶר (perhaps an ass's burden,[2] cf. חֲמוֹר, 1 Sam. xvi. 20), a dry measure generally called כֹּר after the time of the kings, contained (according to Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 9. 2) about ten Attic *μέδιμνοι*,[3] a *μέδιμνος* being a little more than 15 pecks. If any one sowed 150 pecks of grain, not more would be reaped from it than 15 pecks: the harvest there-

[1] See on the *jugerum*, Hultsch, *Griechische und römische Metrologie*, 1862, p. 68 f.

[2] It has been objected to me that, according to *Mezia* 80*a*, a לֶתֶךְ is already equal to ½ חֹמֶר = כֹּר, the amount of a normal ass's burden.

[3] Or rather 7½ Attic Medimni = 10 Attic Metreti = 45 Roman Modii; see Böckh, *Metrologische Untersuchungen*, p. 259.

fore would only yield the tenth part of the seed sown, for the אֵיפָה is the tenth part of חֹמֶר, or three seahs, the usual minimum for one baking (*e.g.* Matt. xiii. 33). In the translation, these relations of measure could not be exactly reproduced.

The second woe, to which the curse falling upon the vine cultivation (ver. 10*a*) leads by association of ideas, is directed against the revellers who carry on their indulgence in carnal security into the day. Ver. 11: "*Woe to those who rise up in the early morning to run after strong drink, who continue till late in the evening, wine inflaming them.*" בֹּקֶר (from בָּקַר, *bakara*, to slit, tear up, split) is the break of day, and נֶשֶׁף (from נָשַׁף, to blow, sigh) the evening twilight (*Berachoth* 3*b*), when it begins to become cool (1 Sam. xxx. 17), and the night into which it passes (chaps. xxi. 4, lix. 10). אַחַר, to continue till late, as in Prov. xxiii. 30; the construct state before words with a preposition, as in chaps. ix. 2, xxviii. 9, and often elsewhere (Ges. § 116. 1). שֵׁכָר, standing with יַיִן, is the general name of all other strong drinks, especially of wines made artificially from fruit, honey, raisins, dates, etc., including barley-wine, *οἶνος κρίθινος*, or beer (*ἐκ κριθῶν μέθυ* in Æschylus, Suppl. 930, elsewhere called *βρῦτον βρυτόν*, *ζῦθος ζύθος*, and various other names), acquaintance with which goes back to Egypt, which was half a wine country and half a beer country, and is traceable up to the time of the Pharaohs. The form שִׁכֹּר is formed like עִנָּב (Arab. *ʿinab*), from שָׁכַר, to intoxicate; according to the Arabic, literally to close by stopping up (סָכַר, סָנַר), *i.e.* to stupefy (cf. Hos. iv. 11). The clauses after the two participles indicate the circumstances (chap. i. 5*a*) under which they run out already in the early morning, and remain sitting till late into the darkness at these *tempestiva convivia* (Cicero, *De Sen.* 14); they hunt after mead, they heat themselves with wine, particularly in order to lull the conscience amid their deeds of darkness.

Ver. 12 describes how these blind ones carry on their music-making and carousing: "*And guitar and harp, kettle-drum and flute and wine is their carouse; but the work of Jehovah they regard not, and the purposing of His hands they do not see.*" Their carouse (מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם, only plural in appearance,

rather a singular, as in Dan. i. 10, 16, and frequently with a softened ' of the ground form מִשְׁתֶּה=מִשְׁתַּי; cf. on עָלֶה, chap. i. 30, and עשֶׂה, chap. xxii. 11, Ges. § 93, 9) is that and that, *i.e.* it consists of such things, it is composed of intoxicating music and wine. Knobel construes it thus: "And there is guitar, etc., and wine is their drink;" but the sentence thus divided becomes feeble, and the other mode of expression is employed in the Semitic to the widest extent, *e.g.* Ezek. xxxviii. 5, "they all are shield and helmet," *i.e.* they appear in this armour. בִּנּוֹר, guitar (an onomatopœic word like צִנּוֹר, cataract, سنّار, spindle), is the general name of the instruments which have their strings drawn (upon a bridge) over the sounding-board; and נֵבֶל (harp and lyre) is the general name of those instruments which have their strings swinging freely, so that both hands could at the same time seize the strings; תֹּף (Arab. *duff*.) is the general name for the tambourine, the drum, and the kettledrum; חָלִיל (bored through) is a general name for the flute and double flute. In this rioting and revelling they have no perception and no eye for the work of Jehovah and the project of His hands. This expresses in idea God's eternal counsel (chap. xxxvii. 26, ver. 19), which leads to salvation by the circuitous ways of judgment (chap. x. 12, xxviii. 21, xxix. 23), in so far as that counsel is realized in history which is shaped by the invisible interposition of God's hands. In their carousing and revelling they have no sense for the moving and working of God in history; nor do they at all observe the judgment which is being prepared in the present. And therefore will the judgment fall upon them in this blind, dull, stupid, animal state.

Ver. 13: "*Therefore my people goes into banishment from want of knowledge; and its glory turns into hungry ones, and its tumult into men with burning thirst.*" As לָכֵן (as in chap. i. 24) opens the threat of punishment, גָּלָה (to emigrate, properly, to lay bare, *i.e.* the land) is a prophetic preterite. Israel must vacate his land, must go into exile, and moreover מִבְּלִי־דָעַת. The מִן of מִבְּלִי is causative as in מִבְּלִי הַדִּעַת, Deut. ix. 28, cf. Num. xiv. 16, and also in Hos. iv. 6: from want of knowledge; and to regard it here as the negative (as in

מֵאֵין), because דעת is indeterminate, is not justified; and besides, our view is supported by מִבְּלִי דַעַת, being immediately joined to 12*b* as a fundamental statement. Moreover, מבלי דעת does not signify "unawares," but unknowingly = undesignedly, and yet more frequently "in non-understanding," Job xxxv. 16, xxxvi. 12, cf. iv. 21. The knowledge which they lack, according to 12*b*, is knowledge of the ruling of God and of the moral order of the world, according to which calamity is the necessary consequence of wrong-doing. In the sequel, כְּבוֹדוֹ and הֲמוֹנוֹ are, as the predicates show, collective terms used in a personal sense; the former signifies the *élite* of the people (cf. Mic. i. 15), and the latter the crowd that lived in riot and revelling. The former become מֻתֵי רָעָב, men of famine (מֻתֵי, as in Gen. xxxiv. 30; Job xi. 11; otherwise אַנְשֵׁי, 2 Sam. xix. 29, or בְּנֵי, 1 Sam. xxvi. 16); and the latter צִחֶה צָמָא (sing. as the subj.), parched with thirst. Instead of מֻתֵי, the LXX. and Jerome read מֵתֵי (dead ones); but the reading adopted by Hitzig, Roorda, Ewald, and Böttcher, מְזֵי (מְזֶה), after Deut. xxxii. 24, and exactly corresponding to the parallel צחה, is more probable; it signifies sucked out or emaciated by hunger. צָחֶה (*ἅπ. λεγ.*) is formed like אָלֵם, כָּהֶה, חָרֵשׁ, and other adjectives which express defects; the place of the *ē* is represented in such forms of verbs ל״ה by an *ä* that has arisen out of *ay*. The debauchees of rank must starve, and the low boon companions must thirst to death.

The threat of punishment commences again with לָכֵן; it has not yet satisfied itself, and therefore reaches deeper still. Ver. 14: "*Therefore the under-world opens wide its throat, and stretches its mouth immeasurably wide; and the pomp of Jerusalem goes down, and its tumult and uproar, and those who are jubilating in it.*" The verbs which follow לָכֵן are prophetic preterites, as in ver. 13. The feminine suffixes attached to what the lower world swallows up, do not refer to שְׁאוֹל, but, as expressed in the translation, to Jerusalem, which is necessarily required by וְעָלַז בָּהּ; שְׁאוֹל has, according to the rule, *Dag. forte conj.* The withdrawal of the tone from וְעָלַז to the penultimate (cf. חָפֵץ in Ps. xviii. 20, xxii. 9, Ezek. xxii. 25, whereby the Zere, which cannot be shortened into Segol, gets the checking Metheg) is here omitted; the rhythm thereby becomes more picturesque: one hears the

falling object rolling down, and at length striking upon something. A mouth is ascribed to the under-world, also a נֶפֶשׁ, *i.e.* a greedy soul, in which sense נֶפֶשׁ is applied metonymically sometimes to a thirst for blood (Ps. xxvii. 12), and sometimes to devouring greed (chap. lvi. 11), and even, as in the present passage and Hab. ii. 5, to the throat or gullet which the soul opens "without measure" (cf. Mal. iii. 10, עַד־בְּלִי־דָי, to insufficiency), when its craving knows no bounds (*Psychol.* p. 204). One is reminded here of Cerberus, whose original was Egyptian: the devourer in Amenthes (nether-world).[1] The prophet appears to connect שְׁאוֹל (which is feminine, like the names of countries) in thought with the verb שָׁאַל (cf. Hab. ii. 5; Prov. xxx. 15): the God-ordered accursed power which calls for and swallows up all that is upon the earth. The idea of "decision" appears to be really connected with the Assyrian *šuâlu*.[2] But the view always still recommends itself, which holds that the Hebrew word starts from the idea of sinking or depth; for the fundamental meaning of the √שׁל is *χαλâν*, not to be hollow, as it might appear after שׁעל (hollowing, properly deepening of the hand), מִשְׁעוֹל (hollow way, properly a sinking of the ground), שׁוּעָל (*excavator* = *cavorum habitator*, properly deepener, one who digs himself in). The designation corresponds to the notion, universal in antiquity, which assigned Hades to the depths below the upper world. As God reveals Himself in heaven among blessed spirits according to the light of His love, so does He reveal Himself in Sheôl, in the darkness and fire of His wrath. And, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah in the Old Testament, with their singular departure from this life, the way of all mortals went hither, until Jesus Christ changed the dying of all believers on Him from a descent into Hades into an ascension to heaven. But even under the Old Testament the believer might know that whoever hid himself on this side the grave in Jehovah the living One, would retain his eternal germ of life even in Sheôl in the midst of the shades, and would taste the divine love even in the midst of wrath. It was this postulate of faith which lay at the foundation of the fact,

[1] See Ludw. Stern, *Ueber das äg. Todtengericht*, Ausland 1870, Nr. 46.

[2] See Alfred Jeremias, *Die babyl.-assyr. Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, 1887, p. 62.

that already under the Old Testament the all-comprehending range of the idea of שְׁאוֹל begins to be contracted into the narrower notion of a limbo or fore-hell (see *Psychol.* p. 415). This is the case in the passage before us, where Isaiah predicts of everything of which Jerusalem was proud, and in which it revelled, including the jubilating persons themselves, descent into Hades; just as the Korahite author of Ps. xlix. wrote (ver. 14) that the pomp of the godless will be given up to Hades to be consumed, without having hereafter a place in the upper world, when the righteous will have dominion over them at some future time. Hades even there is almost equivalent to the New Testament γεέννα.

The prophet now repeats a recurring thought of the second prophetic discourse (chap. ii. 9, 11, cf. ver. 18). It acquires here a much deeper sense, from the connection in which it stands. Vers. 15, 16: "*Then are mean men bowed down, and lords humbled, and the eyes of lofty men are humbled. And Jehovah of hosts shows Himself high in judgment, and God the Holy One hallows Himself in righteousness.*" What had exalted itself above earth to heaven, must go down earthwards into hell. The consecutive imperfects exhibit the future, here represented as historically present, as the direct sequel of what is also represented as present in ver. 14: Hades opens up, and then both low and high in Jerusalem sink down, and the soaring eyes now wander about in a horrible depth. It is the will of God, who is both exalted and holy in Himself, that as the exalted One He shall be exalted, and that as the Holy One He shall be sanctified. But Jerusalem has not done this; and He therefore proves Himself the exalted One by the execution of justice, and sanctifies Himself (נִקְדַּשׁ is to be rendered as a reflective verb, as in Ezek. xxxvi. 23, xxxviii. 23, whereas the reading נִקְדָּשׁ is the expression of a resulting fact), by the manifestation of righteousness, in consequence of which the people of Jerusalem must give Him the glory against their will, as καταχθόνιος (Phil. ii. 10). Jerusalem has been thus swallowed up twice by Hades: once in the Chaldean war, and again in the Roman war. But the invisible background of the outward event was the fact that it had already fallen under the accursed power of hell. Even

in its outward reality, ancient Jerusalem, like the company of Korah (Num. xvi. 30, 33), has become subterranean. Just as Babylon and Nineveh, the ruins of which are dug out of the inexhaustible mine of their wide-stretching foundation and soil, have sunk into the earth, so do men walk about in the present Jerusalem over ancient Jerusalem, which has sunk beneath the ground; and many an enigma of topography will remain an enigma so long as ancient Jerusalem is not scraped out of the earth again.

And considering that the Holy Land is at the present time a great pasture-ground for tribes of Arab shepherds, and that the modern Jerusalem, which has been built out of rubbish, is a Mohammedan city, what ver. 17 prophesies has been literally fulfilled: "*And lambs feed as upon their pasture, and nomad shepherds enjoy the waste places of the bloated ones.*" There is no necessity to supply an accusative object to the verb וְרָעוּ (Knobel and others), namely, the devastated lands mentioned in the second clause (רָעָה, to pasture, as in chap. xxx. 23), nor is כִּדְבָרָם that accusative (Caspari); but the place is determined by the context thus: Where Jerusalem is sunken, there lambs feed in the manner of their own pasture-ground, *i.e.* just as if they were in their old accustomed pasture (דֶּבֶר, as in Micah ii. 12, from דבר, the Targum word for נהג in Exod. iii. 1, is to drive, and כִּדְבָרָם is equivalent to כִּבְדָבְרָם). The lambs meant are those of the גָּרִים mentioned in the second clause, which word, used so substantively as here in distinction from גֵּרִים, indicates strangers putting up anywhere yet settled down, those roaming inconstantly about or leading a nomadic life. Were גָּרִים (cf. chap. xi. 6) referred to the lambs themselves, it would be an idle word. The LXX. translation has ἄρνες, and therefore there must have been read כָּרִים or גְּרִים (which is approved by Ewald, Knobel, Reuss, and Bredenkamp). But one of the lines in the prophecy, which is authenticated by the historical fulfilment, is thereby obliterated. חָרְבוֹת מֵחִים are the lands of those who were formerly full of marrow (*i.e.* full-fed, and strutting about in fulness of enjoyment), which lands have now become wastes. With ver. 17 the second woe closes. It is the longest of the woes. This also confirms the fact that luxury was the chief vice of Judah under Uzziah and Jotham, as it was of

Israel under Jeroboam II. (see Amos vi., where the threat of punishment is also the same).

The third woe is pronounced upon the supposed strong-minded men who challenge the judgment of God by presumptuous sins and blasphemous sayings. Ver. 18: "*Woe unto those who draw criminality with cords of unrighteousness, and sin as with the cart-rope.*" As מָשַׁךְ is also used in Deut. xxi. 3 in the sense of drawing at the yoke, that is to say, drawing a plough or cart, and as the cart or waggon, עֲגָלָה (the word commonly used for a transport waggon, as distinguished from מֶרְכָּבָה, the state-carriage or even the war chariot), is here expressly named, the figure might appear to be the same as that which underlies the New Testament ἑτεροζυγεῖν (2 Cor. vi. 14), and to mean: Evil-doing is the burden which they draw behind them with cords of שָׁוְא, and sin the waggon to which they are harnessed as with (Ewald, § 221*b*) a thick cart-rope (Hofmann, Drechsler, Nägelsbach, Cheyne, and Knabenbauer). But this is hardly the meaning of the prophet. The מֹשְׁכֵי thus put without אֲחֲרֵיהֶם presupposes the signification *attrahere* in itself, as in Ps. x. 9; Job xl. 25 (Knobel and most commentators), and it means this in what is regarded as the closest parallel, Hos. xi. 4: I drew them (*i.e.* to myself) with man's bands, with cords of love. Bredenkamp says rightly: The actual drawing to, is in contrast to the implied farness. שָׁוְא means desolation and emptiness (see Comm. on Ps. xxvi. 4, and especially on Job xv. 31), and in the ethical sense: irreligiousness, unconscientiousness, characterlessness. The cart-rope is an image of the coarse boldness with which they diligently draw to them the sin, which is here considered as making them liable to punishment.[1] They sin forgetful of duty and boldly, because they set themselves in their unbelief above the prophetic threatenings, and look upon the day of Jehovah as an idle terror.

[1] From this Isaianic verse, which is cited in *Sanhedrin* 99*b* as בקבלה (*i.e.* to be found in the prophetic division of the Holy Scripture), springs the proverb הילהו של חטא הוא דומה לחוט של כוביא אבל סופו להיות כעבותות העגלה; see *Sifri* 33*a*, ed. Friedmann. Hesba Stretton has made it the motto of her novel, *Cobwebs and Cables*, 1882, where it is rendered: *Sins are at first like cobwebs, at last like cables.* The English *cob* corresponds to the Talmudic כּוֹבְיָא.

Ver. 19 : " *Who say, Let him hasten, let him then speed on his work that we may see; and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel now draw near and come so that we may experience it.*" They doubt that the day of Jehovah will ever come (Ezek. xii. 22; Jer. v. 12 f.; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3 f.); and they go so far in their unbelief as to wish for what they cannot and will not believe, and challenge it to come so as to see it with their own eyes and experience it (Jer. xvii. 15; otherwise than in Amos v. 18 and Mal. ii. 17–iii. 1, where this wishing does not proceed from scorn and defiance, but from impatience and littleness of faith). As the two verbs denoting haste are used both intransitively (Judg. xx. 37, to make haste, to hasten) and transitively, the passage may also be translated: let his work haste, hurry itself on (Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, and Drechsler); but we prefer the transitive sense in accordance with chap. lx. 22. The forms יָחִישָׁה (*Hi.* from חוּשׁ = Beduin حاس, to move oneself quickly, to drive along, *DMZ.* xxii. 159 f.) and תָּבוֹאָה are, along with Ps. xxiv. and Job xi. 17, in fact the only examples of a voluntative in the third person, strengthened by the *ah* of summons or challenge; for the imperfects in *ah* in Ezek. xxiii. 20 and Job xx. 21 are double feminine forms (Ges. § 48, 3). The fact that the freethinkers call God קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, while they yet scoff at His self-attestation actually authenticating this name, is explained from chap. xxx. 11: They take this name of God out of the mouth of the prophet, so that their scorn applies to both God and His prophet at the same time.

The fourth woe is expressed in ver. 20: " *Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; who give out darkness for light, and light for darkness; who give out bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.*" The previous woe had reference to those who made the facts of sacred history the butt of their naturalistic doubt and ridicule, especially so far as they were the subject of prophecy. This fourth woe relates to those who adopted a code of morals that completely overturned the first principles of ethics, and was utterly opposed to the law of God; for evil, darkness, and bitter, with their opposites, represent fundamental moral principles that are essentially related (Matt. vi. 23; Jas. iii. 11). Evil, as antitheistic, is dark in its

nature, and therefore loves darkness, and is exposed to the punitive power of darkness. And although it may be sweet as regards its material enjoyment, it is nevertheless bitter, inasmuch as it produces abhorrence and disgust in the godlike nature of man, and, after a brief self-deception, is turned into the bitter woe of miserable consequences. Darkness and light, bitter and sweet, therefore, are not tautological metaphors for evil and good; but designations of evil and good according to their essential natures, and their necessary and internal effects. The שָׂמִים, with following לְ, parallel to הָאֹמְרִים (with *Mercha*, not *Darga*), has a subjective meaning, as in Job xvii. 12.

The fifth woe, ver. 21: "*Woe unto those who are wise in their own eyes, and who are prudent in their own sight.*" The third woe had reference to the unbelieving naturalists, the opponents of prophecy, נבואה; the fourth woe referred to the moralists, who brought ideas into confusion; and to this woe is attached by a closely-connected thought the woe denounced upon those whom want of humility makes inaccessible for the חכמה, which goes hand in hand with the נבואה,—that wisdom of which the fear of Jehovah is the basis (Ps. cxi. 10; Prov. i. 7; Job xxviii. 28; Eccles. xii. 13). "Be not wise in thine own eyes," is a fundamental rule of this wisdom (Prov. iii. 7). Upon this wisdom rests the prophetic state-policy, whose warnings, as we read in chap. xxviii. 9, 10, they rejected so contemptuously. That in this woe the prophet had specially in view the untheocratic state-expediency, is shown by the sixth woe, which is directed to the administration of right in the State.

The sixth woe, vers. 22, 23: "*Woe unto those who are heroes to drink wine, and bold men to mix strong drink, who acquit evil-doers for a bribe, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from everybody.*" We see from ver. 23 that the drinkers in ver. 22 are unjust judges. The threatening of these is everywhere Isaiah's *ceterum censeo;* and accordingly it is also here the content of the sixth and last woe. They are heroes, yet not in avenging wrong, but in drinking wine; they are famous men, yet not for deciding between guilt and innocence, but for mixing strong drink, that is to say, with spices (so Cheyne, Knabenbauer, and others; cf. *vinum aromatites*,

myrrhinum, absynthites, etc. in Pliny).[1] The wine of the Jews of the present day in Jerusalem and Hebron, Guthe tells me, is always spiced, and it thereby acquires great power of heating, and passes violently into the blood, a fact which agrees with the ידליקם in chap. v. 11. But it always remains questionable (cf. on Song of Sol. vii. 3) whether it is not mixing with water that is meant. It was an old custom to temper or dilute wine and other spirituous liquors (שֵׁכָר, *e.g.* date wine and cider) by an addition of water, and to make them more agreeable for drinking (Maimonides' הלכות חמץ ומצה, vii. 9), which is called מָסַךְ (in the Mishna מזג, *Aboda zara* 58*b*), wherefore this verb also comes to mean to pour in, to fill up, chap. xix. 14 (in Mishn. מזג), *e.g. Pesachim* x. 1, and elsewhere, and the classical *κεραννύναι* and *temperare*. Accordingly מֶסֶךְ, מִמְסָךְ, or מֶזֶג signifies any kind of fine tasting wine which has been made palatable by spicing or diluting (Arab. *chamr memzûǵa*). In such preparation of intoxicating drinks they are praiseworthy and strong, and therefore the more accessible to bribery for acquitting the guilty and condemning the just (Deut. xxv. 1; Prov. xvii. 15); beclouding themselves with strong drink, they become blind to right, and get bold for wrong, chap. xxviii. 7 f.; Prov. xxxi. 5. עֵקֶב (Arab. *'ukb*, whereas עֲקֵב, a heel = *'akib*) is an adverbial accusative: in compensation for, or for pay; and מִפְּנֵי (which, as one is tempted to read מֵהֶם, belongs, according to the Masora, to the misleading ממנו) refers back distributively to צַדִּיקִים; as, for example, in Hos. iv. 8.

In the three denunciations of woes in vers. 18–21, Isaiah confined himself to the mere unexplicated הוי. On the other hand, the first two woes denounced upon the covetous and the revellers were already expanded into a detailed announcement of punishment. But now, when the prophet has reached the bad judges, the announcement of punishment breaks out so vehemently that a return to the form of the mere expression of woe is not to be thought of. To the two therefores, לָכֵן, in vers. 13, 14, a third is now added in ver. 24: "*Therefore as fire's tongue devours stubble, and hay collapses in flame, their root*

[1] The Assyrian Syllabaries enumerate several kinds of such spiced wines, such as *karanu lâni* = Absinth wine (*karanu* =קרינא, *Aboda zara* 30*a*. Cf. Nöldeke in *DMZ.* xxxiii. 331).

will become as mould, and their blossom fly up as dust; for they have despised the Torah of Jehovah of hosts, and scornfully rejected the proclamation of the Holy One of Israel." The persons primarily intended are those described in vers. 22, 23, but with an extension of the range of view to Judah and Jerusalem, the vineyard of which they are the bad fruit. The sinners are compared to a plant which moulders both above and below, and therefore altogether, into dust (cf. chap. xxxvii. 31; Job xviii. 16; Amos ii. 9; Mal. iii. 19; and the expression, "let there not be to him root below and fruit above," in the epitaph on the sarcophagus of the Phenician king אשמנעזר, Eśmun'azar). Their root moulders in the earth, and their blossom (פֶּרַח, the same as in chap. xviii. 5) turns to fine dust which the wind carries away. And this transformation of root and blossom takes place very suddenly as through the force of fire. In the expression כֵּאֲכֹל קַשׁ לְשׁוֹן אֵשׁ וְחֵשֶׁשׁ, which consists of five short words with five sibilants (cf. Jo. ii. 5), one hears the crackling sparks, the lambent flame. When the infinitive construct is connected with both subject and object, the subject generally stands first, as in chap. lxiv. 1, but here it is the object, as in chap. xx. 1 (with reference to the former, compare the similar Arabic form *katlun Zeidun 'Amran*). The infinitive construct passes in the second clause into the finite verb just as in the similarly constructed passage, chap. lxiv. 1. As יִרְפֶּה has the intransitive meaning *collabi*, either לֶהָבָה is *acc. loci*, or חֵשֶׁשׁ לֶהָבָה is the construct state, and means flame-hay, *i.e.* hay destined for the flame, or going up in flames.[1] As the reason

[1] In Arabic also, *haśîś* signifies hay; but in common usage (at least in Syriac) it is applied not to dried grass, but to meadow-green grass or green barley: hence the expression *yaḥuśś* here gives green fodder. Here, however, in Isaiah, חֵשֶׁשׁ is equivalent to *ḥasîś yâbiś*, and this is its true original meaning. In the time of the kings, as is evident from Amos vii. 1, the growth of grass was twice mown, specially in order to be used as fodder for cattle; לֶקֶשׁ there is hay in the proper sense, *i.e.* grass for fodder after the first cropping. In our day it is only in March and April that grass and green barley are cut and used as fodder; during the rest of the year the fodder is made up of barley and chopped straw (תֶּבֶן, 1 Kings v. 28). When grass is otherwise cut, it is used for firing. Stubble and wild growths, when dried by the heat of the sun, are set on fire and burnt to ashes (see James Neil in *Jewish Intelligence*, 1886, pp. 66–69).

why the plantation of Judah so suddenly dies out, instead of certain particular sins, there is at once named the sin of all sins, the rejection of the word of God with the heart (מָאַס), and in word and deed (נִאֵץ). The twofold אֵת and וְאֵת give prominence to the object, and the קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, changing with יְהוָה, makes the sin appear all the greater, the more exalted and holy the God is who reveals Himself in His word, and who has, moreover, revealed Himself to Israel as His own peculiar people. No sooner has the prophet named the guilty sin of Judah, than the proclamation of punishment has also got new fuel, and it flares forth anew in ver. 25: "*Wherefore the anger of Jehovah is kindled against His people, and He stretches His hand over it and smites it; then the mountains tremble, and its carcase becomes like outsweepings in the midst of the streets,—with all this His anger is not stilled, and His hand remains stretched out.*" The last words are repeated in chaps. ix. 11, 16, x. 4, as a refrain. Cheyne thinks with Ewald, that vers. 25–30 had a place originally within chap. ix. 7–x. 4; and Bredenkamp expounds chaps. v. 24, 25, ix. 7–11, 12–16, 17–20, x. 1–4, as five connected strophes. But what could have occasioned their separation from each other? As chap. iii. 14 is a prelude to chap. v. 1–7, this passage from vers. 25–30, with the formula, "with all this His anger is not stilled . . . ," may also be a prelude to chaps. ix. 7–x. 4; and further, in chap. v. 15 there is repeated chap. ii. 9, 17, without chap. v. and chap. ii. sq. therefore being a whole. The judgment upon Judah which stands here before the soul of the prophet, is certainly a future and not a past judgment; for the verbs after עָלֶיהָ are like those after the three previous לָכֵן, *praett. prophetica*. It is therefore impossible to interpret the phrase, "then the hills tremble," as a reference to the earthquake in the time of Uzziah (Amos i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5). This judgment in the near future will consist in Jehovah stretching out His hand over His people, or, as it is elsewhere said, swinging it over them (Luther: swaying or moving it hither and thither), chaps. xi. 15, xix. 16, xxx. 30, 32; and bringing it down upon Judah with a blow, the violence of which gets to be felt by the surroundings of nature as well as by men. What sort of blow this will be, may be inferred from the fact that

the corpses lie unburied upon the streets like the common sweepings. The reading חֲצוֹת is to be rejected, for either חֲצוֹת, as the Complut., or חוּצוֹת, which has the Masora on Num. xx. 39 in its favour. It at once occurs to compare כַּסּוּחָה with the Arabic *kusâḥa*, sweepings, scourings, from كسح, to sweep, to scour (see on chap. xxxiii. 12); but *kusâḥa* is the common form for such refuse (*e.g. ḳulâma*, nail-paring), while כַּסּוּחָה must mean swept out, and then as there was no reason for using here the form כַּסּוּחַ, any more than חֲלוּק, חָרוּץ, שַׁבּוּל, כְּסוּחָה had to be written. Hence the כ is to be taken as that of comparison, and סוּחָה is to be derived from סוּחַ (*verrere*), as סְחִי from סָחָה (سحا synonymous with كسح). It will therefore not be a pestilence (which, moreover, as a stroke of God is indicated not by הַכָּה, but נָגַף), but a carnage of war; and in reference to the still more fearful judgment threatened in vers. 26 sqq., which is to proceed from the world-power, it cannot be doubted that the spirit of prophecy here indicates the bloodshed brought about by the Syro-Ephraimitic war in Judah (see 2 Chron. xxviii. 5, 6). The mountains may well have then trembled under the marching of troops and the clashing of arms, and the felling down of trees, and the shrieks of woe, and nature in any case had to suffer along with what men had incurred; for nature is related to man according to God's creative order, as the body of man to his soul. Every infliction of the wrath of God which falls upon a people, smites at the same time the land which has deteriorated with it; and in this sense the mountains of Judah then quaked, although only to the hearing of initiated ears. But for all this (בְּ, notwithstanding, in spite of, as in Job i. 22), Jehovah's anger, as the prophet foresees, will not turn away as it does when He is satisfied, and His hand will remain always still stretched out over Judah in order to strike again.

Jehovah does not take the human instruments of His further strokes anywhere from Israel and the neighbouring peoples, but from the peoples in far-off lands. Ver. 26: "*And He lifts up a banner for the distant peoples, and hisses to it from the end of the earth; and behold hurrying hastily it comes hither.*" What the prophet here prophesies already

began to be fulfilled in the time of Ahaz. But the prophecy which starts with this verse bears in it all the possible marks of being the opposite of a *vaticinium post eventum.* It is properly only what was threatened in Deut. xxviii. 49 sqq. (cf. chap. xxxii. 21 sqq.), which is here presented in a more plastic form, but which yet appears to the perception of the prophet as if emerging out of mist. God summons the far-off peoples; מֵרָחוֹק is here and in chap. xlix. 1 virtually an adjective, as Jer. xxiii. 23 it is virtually a substantive. It combines the meanings from afar, as *e.g.* in chaps. xxv. 1, xliii. 6, and far away, as *e.g.* in chaps. xxii. 3, xxiii. 6, cf. chap. xvii. 13, as in Homer, ἔκαθεν, from far, may have the sense of far away (so with the opposite, ἔγγυθεν, near); the measure of length being determined from the *terminus ad quem* backwards, instead of from the *terminus a quo* forwards. In this passage and elsewhere מרחוק has become fixed into an expression of distance, with the whence and whither lost sight of (see on chap. xxxvii. 26). The visible working of God presents itself sensibly to the prophet in two figures. Jehovah plants a banner or standard which, like an optical telegraph, tells the peoples still at a far distance, like the battle-horn, שׁוֹפָר, that they are to band themselves together for war. נֵס is a high staff with a fluttering banner (chap. xxxiii. 23), set up upon a bare mountain-top (chap. xiii. 2); נָשָׂא, in this favourite figure of Isaiah, alternates with הָרִים. The peoples through whom this was first fulfilled, were those of the Assyrian empire. These peoples are regarded as far off, dwelling at the end of the earth (chap. xxxix. 3), not merely inasmuch as the Euphrates formed the boundary to the north-east between what was geographically known and unknown to the Israelites (Ps. lxxii. 8; Zech. ix. 10), but also inasmuch as the prophet has in his mind a complex body of peoples stretching away into further Asia. The second figure is taken from a bee-master, who entices the bees with hissing or whistling to come out of their hives and settle on the ground; as Virgil (*Georg.* iv. 54) says to the bee-master who wants to make the bees settle down: "Raise a tinkling sound, and beat the cymbals of Cybele round the quarter."[1] Thus does Jehovah

[1] This tinkling with scythes and cymbals is now regarded as of no use; see Gedde's *Apiarium Anglicum* (1721), xv. § 13.

entice the banded peoples, like swarms of bees (chap. vii. 18), who now swarm hither, hurrying rapidly. The plural passes into the singular, for those who are approaching appear at first as an indistinguishable agglomerated mass; but it is also possible that the ruling people among the many is fixed upon. The perception and the expression are both misty, and this is quite characteristic. With הִנֵּה the prophet points to those who step into his circle of vision; מְהֵרָה קַל, they are coming on, *i.e.* in the shortest time, with quick feet, and the nearer they come within his view, the more distinctly can he describe them.—Ver. 27: "*There is none wearied, and no one stumbling among them; they give themselves no slumber and no sleep, and to none is the girdle of his hips loosed; and to none is the thong of his shoes rent asunder.*" Notwithstanding the long, far march, there is no one fatigued, עָיֵף, who had been obliged to fall out singly and remain behind (Deut. xxv. 18; Isa. xiv. 31). There is no כּוֹשֵׁל; for they march on, pressing incessantly forwards, as if on a levelled road (Jer. xxxi. 9). From their eagerness for the conflict they do not slumber (נוּם, mimetic of audible breathing), to say nothing of them sleeping (יָשֵׁן): they do not slumber in order to repose, and they do not allow themselves the usual night's rest. The girdle of his armour-shirt or coat-of-mail in which the sword is inserted (Neh. iv. 12), is lacking in none; not even the shoe-thong of any one, with which the sandals are fastened and knotted, is rent asunder (נִתַּק, *disrumpitur*). The description of their wanting rest forms a *climax descendens*, while the representation of the tightness and lastingness of their armour is a *climax ascendens;* the two statements follow each other after the manner of a *chiasmus.*

The prophet now describes their weapons and war-chariots. Ver. 28: "*He whose arrows are sharpened, and all his bows strung; the hoofs of his horses are accounted like to flint, and his wheels to the whirlwind.*" As perceived by the prophet, they are moving always nearer. For they have brought with them pointed arrows in their quivers (chap. xxii. 6). But all their bows are already trodden (which implies that, as they were in length as much as the height of a man, this was done by means of setting the left foot upon the inner bend); and the fact shows that they find themselves near their goal. The

right reading is קְשֻׁחֹתָיו, with *Dag. dirimens* (Gesen. § 20. 2*b*), as, according to Abulwalid, Kimchi, and other witnesses, it is also in Ps. xxxvii. 15. As the horses in ancient times were not shod, firm hoofs, *ὄπλαι καρτεραί*, were, according to Xenophon's *Hippikos*, a prime quality of a good horse. The horses of the enemy now drawing near to Judah have hoofs which must be found like flint (צֹר, *ἁπ. λεγ.* = Arab. *ẓirr*, Syr. *ṭarânâ*), hard, sharp-cornered or sharp-pointed stone. Homer calls such horses *χαλκόποδες*, brass-footed. And the two wheels of each of the war-chariots, in front of which the horses are harnessed, turn with such rushing rapidity, and throw everything down before them with such violence, not merely as if the whirlwind drove, but as if they were the whirlwind itself (chap. lxvi. 15 ; Jer. iv. 13). Nahum compares them to flashes of lightning, chap. ii. 5.—Thus far the description of the prophet moves on as if in double quick marches, through clauses consisting of from two to four words. Now the description becomes heavy and stealthy, and then springs, in a few sentences, like a carnivorous beast upon its prey. Ver. 29 : "*A roar he raises like the lioness ; he roars like the lions and growls low,—seizes the prey, carries it off, and no one rescues.*" The imperfects (*Kerî*, יִשְׁאַג), with the preceding שְׁאָגָה לוֹ, which is equivalent to a future (according to which also *Chethîb*, וְיִשְׁאַג, is, therefore, admissible as *perf. consec.*), hold fast every separate factor of the description for consideration. The lion roars when he longs eagerly for prey, and such now is the battle-cry of the bloodthirsty enemy, which the prophet compares to the roar of the lioness (לָבִיא, Copt. *laboi*, with the feminine form, לְבִיָּה[1]), and with the roar of young lions full of strength (כְּפִירִים). In place of the roaring there succeeds a growling (נָהַם, *fremitus*, Prov. xix. 12), when the lion makes himself ready, and prepares to fall upon his prey.[2] And so the prophet hears, in the army thus ready for battle, a low, evil-foreboding hum. But he immediately also perceives how the enemy seizes his booty and drags it irrecoverably away (יַפְלִיט, properly, how he makes it slip away, *i.e.* brings it into

[1] In Arabic, *en-nehem* is used to signify greediness (see Ali's *Proverbs*, No. 16).

[2] The Indo-Germanic names of the lion appear to be connected with לָבִיא, perhaps also לַיִשׁ; see Curtius, *Griech. Etymol.* No. 543.

a place of safety; cf. Micah vi. 14). This prey or booty is Judah. And it adds to the weird, gloomy character of the prophecy that the prophet does not name Judah. As if he was not able to let it pass his lips, this object still remains unexpressed in ver. 30: "*And there is a deep moaning over it in that day, like the moaning of the sea; and he looks to the earth, and behold darkness—tribulation and light—it becomes night in the clouds of heaven over there.*" The roar of the lion and the surging of the sea are so like each other in the impression they make, that *Sierra Leone* (Sierra = Arab. سِرَاج, mountain chain) took its name from the fact that those who first landed there took the noise of the waves breaking on the steep shores for the roaring of lions. The subject of וְיִנְהֹם is the mass of the enemy; and in the expressions עָלָיו and נִבַּט (with the Pi. used only here instead of the usual Hi. הִבִּיט) the prophet has the people of Judah in view as the enemy falls upon them with a roar like the sea, and thus rushes as in sea-billows over them. And when the people of Judah looked to the earth, and therefore to the land in which they dwelt, darkness presents itself to them,—a darkness in which is swallowed up every friendly and smiling aspect formerly exhibited by it. And what further? צַר וָאוֹר have been explained as moon (=סַהַר) and sun (Jewish expositors), and as stone and gleam = hail and lightning (Drechsler); but these and similar explanations depart too far from the ordinary usage. And the separation of the words צַר and אוֹר, proposed by Hitzig, Gesenius (*Thesaurus*), Ewald, Knobel, Umbreit, Schegg, Meier, Luzzatto, Nägelsbach (who refers to Job xviii. 16), and Bredenkamp, so that the one word closes a sentence ("darkness of tribulation") and the other opens one (Cheyne: "*yea, the light is dusk through the clouds thereof*"), is against the impression of the connection made by the two monosyllables, and which is supported by the punctuation. However, we thus obtain a connected thought, as in the Vulg.: *et ecce tenebrae tribulationis et lux obtenebrata est in caligine ejus* (Jer.). But if צַר וָאוֹר are left together, a still more expressive meaning results. צַר וָאוֹר are tribulation and lighting up, the one following the other and passing over into the other, like morning and night, chap. xxi. 12. This

pair of words forms an interjectional clause, which states that when the prophesied darkness has settled itself on the land of Judah, this will not yet be the last, but that an alternation of anxiety and a glimmering of hope will follow it, until it will have become utterly dark in עֲרִיפֶיהָ, the clouded sky over the land of Judah (עֲרִיפִים, *áπ. λεγ.*, from עָרַף; cf. זָרַף, نَزَفَ, to drop or trickle, whence also עֲרָפֶל, with which Jerome confounds it, and the suffix referring back to לָאָרֶץ, ארץ at one time denoting the earth as a whole, and at another the land as forming a part of the earth). The prophet here prophesies that before it comes to an extremity with Judah, approaches will be made towards it within which a divine respite will always again appear. Grace tries and always tries again to spare, till at last the measure of sin is full, and the period for repentance has expired. The history of the Jewish people runs on, according to this law, till the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The Assyrian troubles, and the miraculous light of divine help which arose in the annihilation of the host of Sennacherib, form the foreground of the sad course of history, which ever and again awakened hope, but at last ended in utter darkness.

Thus closes the third prophetic discourse. It begins with a parable which contains Israel's history *in nuce*, and closes with an emblem which symbolically represents the gradual but sure accomplishment of the penal termination of the parable. This third discourse is therefore not less complete in itself than the second. The kindred references are explained from the contemporary basis of them being the same, both being grounded and founded upon the powerful and rich, but also proud and luxurious Uzziah - Jotham time of peace. The terrible slaughter in the Syro-Ephraimitish war, which broke out at the end of the reign of Jotham, and the varied complications with the imperial world-power which king Ahaz introduced, and which issued eventually in the destruction of the kingdom of Judah,—the period in the history of the kingdoms of the world, or great empires, to which the Syro-Ephraimitish war was the prelude,—still lies for the prophet in the womb of the future. The description of the great mass of people rolling over Judah

from afar is couched in such nameless and general terms, and is so vague and misty, that we cannot but say that everything that was to happen to the people of God on the part of the world-power during the five great and extended periods of judgment that were now so soon to commence (viz. the Assyrian, the Chaldean, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman), is here unfolding itself out of the mist of futurity, and presenting itself to the prophetic eye of the seer. Already in the time of Ahaz the character of the prophecy changes in this respect. It is then that the eventful relation of Israel to the imperial power assumes its first concrete shape in the form of a relation to Assur (Assyria). And from that time forth the imperial power in the mouth of the prophet is no longer an unknown quantity; for although the notion of the world-power was not yet embodied in Assur, yet it is called Assur, and Assur represents it. It also necessarily follows from this, that chaps. ii.–iv., v. belong to the time anterior to Ahaz, *i.e.* to that of Uzziah and Jotham. But several puzzling questions suggest themselves here. If chaps. ii.–iv., v. were uttered under Uzziah and Jotham, how could Isaiah begin with a promise (chap. ii. 1–4) which is repeated word for word in Micah iv. 1 sqq., where it is the direct antithesis of the threat, in chap. iii. 12, which was uttered by Micah, according to Jer. xxvi. 18, in the time of Hezekiah? Again, if we consider the advance made in this threatening prophecy from the general expressions with which it commences in chap. i. to the close of chap. v., in what relation does this discourse in chap. i. stand to chaps. ii.–iv., v., seeing that vers. 7–9 are not ideal, but have a contemporary historical reference, and therefore at least presuppose the Syro-Ephraimitish war? And lastly, if chap. vi. does really relate, as it apparently does, to the calling of Isaiah to the prophetic office, how are we to explain the singular fact that three prophetic discourses precede the history of his call, which ought properly to stand at the opening of the book? Drechsler and Caspari have attempted to explain this by maintaining that chap. vi. contains an account of the call of the prophet, who was already installed in his office, to a particular mission. The proper heading to be adopted for chap. vi. would therefore be, "The consecration of the prophet

as the preacher of the judgment of hardening;" and if chap. vi. stands in its true historical place, it would contain the result or sequel of the preceding prophetic preaching. But true as it is that the whole of the central portion of Israel's history, which lies midway between the commencement and the close, is divided into halves by the contents of chap. vi., and that the significant importance of Isaiah as a prophet consists especially in the fact that he stood upon the boundary between these two historic halves, yet there are serious objections which present themselves to such a view of chap. vi. It is possible, indeed, that this distinctive importance may have been given to Isaiah's calling and appointment at his very first call. And what Umbreit says—namely, that chap. vi. must make the impression upon every unprejudiced mind of its being the prophet's inaugural vision—cannot really be denied. But the position in which chap. vi. stands in the book itself exercises an influence contrary to this impression, unless that position can be accounted for in some other way. The impression, however, still remains (just as at chap. i. 7–9), and recurs again and again. We will therefore proceed to chap. vi. without labouring to efface it. It is possible that we may discover some other satisfactory explanation of the enigmatical position of chap. vi. in relation to what has preceded it.

The Prophet's Account of his Divine Mission, Chap. VI.

The time of the occurrence narrated in the following words: *In the death-year of the king Uzziah,* is important as regards the prophet himself. The statement thus made in the naked form in which it is here prefixed, makes a much sharper impression than if it commenced with וַיְהִי (cf. Ex. xvi. 6; Prov. xxiv. 27). It was the year of the death of Uzziah (as he is also called in 2 Kings xv. 13, 2 Chron. chap. xxvi., whereas he is called Azaria in 2 Kings xiv. 21, 1 Chron. xii. 12, and in cuneiform inscriptions). It was therefore the year in which Uzziah was still reigning, although his death was at hand; not the first year of Jotham's reign, but the last of Uzziah's; for it is more than highly probable that in the calculation of the regnant years of the kings, the year of the accession of one king was reckoned to his prede-

cessor as his last (Mc. v. Niebuhr, Wellhausen, Dillmann). Consequently, although the first call (Heyschius: ἡ χειροτονία τοῦ προφήτου) of Isaiah is narrated in chap. vi., yet in the superscription of chap. i. the ministry of the prophet is rightly dated from Uzziah; for although his activity under Uzziah was but very short, yet it is reckoned as a very significant epoch-making beginning. It is true that, according to 2 Chron. xxvi. 22, Isaiah wrote a historical work embracing the whole time of the reign of Uzziah, but it does not follow from this that he appeared in public long before Uzziah's death. If he was called in the year of the death of Uzziah, then that historical work was a historical retrospect of the times of Uzziah. According to the Biblical statement, Uzziah reigned fifty-two years. This long period was for the kingdom of Judah what the less lengthened period of Solomon had been for the whole of Israel—a time of powerful and happy peace, in which the people were completely flooded with proofs of the love of their God. But the richness of this divine goodness exercised as little influence over the people as did their earlier troubles. And now the eventful change in the relationship of Jehovah to Israel occurred for which Isaiah was chosen to be the instrument, primarily and before other prophets. The year in which this took place was the year of the death of Uzziah. In this year Israel as a people was given up to hardness of heart, and Israel in the mass, as a kingdom and country, was given over to annihilation and devastation by the imperial power. How significant is it that, as Jerome remarks (in his *Ep.* 18 *ad Damasum*), the death year of Uzziah is the birth year of Romulus, and that Rome was founded shortly after Uzziah's death in 754–3 B.C.!

In this year, the prophet goes on to relate: "*Then I saw the All-Lord*[1] *sitting upon a high and exalted throne, and His skirts fill the temple.*" Isaiah sees, and, moreover, not when sleeping and dreaming, but God gives him while awake a look into the invisible world, by opening within him the inner sense for the supersensible, while the external activity of the senses ceases; and he presents this supersensible object in sensible form on account of the spirituo-corporeal nature of

[1] [German: *Allherr.*—Tr.]

man, and his limitation by the present life. This is the mode of revelation characteristic of ecstatic vision (ἐν ἐκστάσει or ἐν πνεύματι). Isaiah, then, is here transported to heaven; for although elsewhere prophetic ecstasies have the earthly temple as the place and object of the seeing (Amos ix. 1; Ezek. viii. 3, x. 4, 5; Acts xxii. 17); yet here the high exalted throne (to which and to Him sitting on it, chap. lvii. 15, רָם וְנִשָּׂא is to be referred) is the heavenly counterpart of the earthly throne of the mercy-seat; and therefore הֵיכָל (properly, spacious hall, a name of the temple as the palace of God the King), as in Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7, xxix. 9, and frequently elsewhere, is not the Jerusalem temple (Reuss and others), but the heavenly temple. There he sees the universal ruler, or, as we prefer to translate this name, formed from אָדַן=דּוּן,[1] the All-Lord sitting (יֹשֵׁב is an accusative predicate, for the Hebrew expression is like the Latin form *vidi te ambulantem*), and, moreover, in human form (Ezek. i. 26), as is shown by the trailing robe, of which the floating ends or skirts fill the hall (שׁוּלָיִם, as in Ex. xxviii. 33, from שׁוּל=سال, *med. O*, and ذال, *med. Y*, to hang down loose, see on chap. v. 14). The LXX., Targum, Jerome have obliterated the figure of the trailing robe as too anthropomorphic. But John in his Gospel is bold enough to say that it was Jesus whose glory Isaiah beheld (John xii. 41); for the incarnation of the Logos is the truth of all the Biblical anthropomorphisms. The heavenly temple is the super-terrestrial place which Jehovah, by giving Himself to be beheld there by angels and saints, makes into a heaven and a temple. In giving His glory to be beheld, He must at the same time veil it, because the creature cannot bear it. But what veils it is not less splendid than what of it is made manifest. It is this which is symbolized to Isaiah in the long trailing robe. He sees the Lord, and what he further sees is the all-filling splendid robe of the indescribable One. As far as the look of the seer reaches, the ground is covered everywhere with this splendid robe. There is therefore no place to stand there. In accordance with this, the vision of the seraphim is determined

[1] Comp. *Der Waltende* as applied to God by the Old German and Anglo-Saxon poets.

ver. 2: "*Seraphim stood over Him, each one of which had six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew.*" מִמַּעַל לוֹ is not to be explained as near to him; for although the mode of expression that one in standing finds himself עַל, over one sitting, Ex. xviii. 13, or even מֵעַל, above him, Jer. xxxvi. 21 (2 Chron. xxvi. 19, מֵעַל לְמִזְבַּח הַקְּטֹרֶת, above the altar of incense), is also used of spirits, Job i. 6; 1 Kings xxii. 19; Zech. vi. 5; and of men, Zech. iv. 14, in relation to God upon His throne, where an actual towering above is not to be thought of; yet ממעל לו, that strongest expression for *supra*, cannot be otherwise than literally meant; and hence the Targum and Rashi explain it "above, for His service." The sequence of the accents can be taken as in favour of this view (Luzzatto); it is the same as in Gen. i. 5*a*. How Isaiah thinks of this standing above Him who is on the throne, is to be inferred from the use made of the wings of the seraphim. The imperfects do not state what they are accustomed to do (Böttcher and others), but what the seer saw them do; he saw them fly with two of their six wings (יְפָתַיִם, dual, instead of the plural, as also elsewhere in the case of words used for what is presented in pairs, *DMZ.* xxxii. 33). They therefore stood flying, that is, they hovered (cf. עמד, Num. xiv. 14), as is said of the earth and the stars: they stand although in free space, Job xxvi. 7; and as Apuleius says of the eagle when fixing his prey: *volatu pacne eodem loco pendula circumtuetur*. It is true that the seraphim (how many not determined [1]) are not to be regarded as towering over the head of Him who is sitting on the throne, although לו applies to Him, and not to the throne (Jer. *super illud*, scil. *solium*); but they hovered over His robe that filled the hall, being supported by the two outspread wings, while with two other wings they covered their faces in awe before the divine glory (Targ. *ne videant*), and with two wings they covered their feet in the feeling of the deep distance of the creature from the Holiest of all (Targ. *ne videantur*), as the cherubim in Ezek. i. 11 do their bodies. This is the only

[1] Nestle draws my attention to the fact that Origen only accepts two seraphim, and refers the suffix of פניו and רגליו to God. The LXX. favour this view, for they have merely τὸ πρόσωπον and τοὺς πόδας (without αὐτῶν, as in the imperfect text of the Stier-Theil Polyglott).

passage in the Holy Scripture where the seraphim are mentioned. The representation of the Church, which took its rise from Dionysius Areopagita, represents them as at the head of the nine choirs of angels; the first rank or order is formed by the seraphim, cherubim, and *throni*, for which view it may be adduced that the cherubim in Ezekiel bear up the chariot of the divine throne, whereas here the seraphim hover round the seat of the divine throne. In any case the seraphim and cherubim are heavenly beings, different in kind; the attempts to prove their identity have only an apparent support in Rev. iv. 8. Further, שְׂרָפִים certainly does not mean merely spirits as such, but if not the most exalted of all, yet such as have a separate place before the others; for the Scriptures really teach a gradation in their rank, *hierarchia coelestis*. As the cherubim of Ezekiel are three-fourths in animal form, and the writer of the Apocalypse gives animal forms to three of the four ζῶα, which are six-winged, like the seraphim here (Rev. iv. 7, 8), the seraphim thus appear, apart from what was human shaped in them, necessarily to be represented as winged dragons; for the serpent lifted up by Moses is called שָׂרָף in Num. xxi. 8, and the flying dragon in xiv. 29, שָׂרָף מְעוֹפֵף, from שׂרף (to burn, and particularly to cause burning wounds, whereas *serpens* is related to ἕρπειν, *repere*[1]). In any case the name seraphim includes the idea of burning, and in any view the sensible externality in which they appear to the seer is an emblematic embodiment of their supposed nature. While the seraphim hover above on both sides of the throne, and thus form two semicircular choirs hovering over against each other, they worship Him that sits on the throne as in a responsive hymn. Ver. 3: "*And one cried aloud to the other, and spake: Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts, filling the whole earth is His glory.*" The meaning is not that they raised their voice in concert at the same time (Luzzatto); nor is אֶל used in Ps. xlii. 8 in this sense as = בְּנֶגֶד; but it was an antiphonal song proceeding without interruption. Some of them commenced and others responded, whether they repeated the whole Trisagion or continued the

[1] Cheyne, like Riehm, sees in the cherub of the original extra-Israelite representation, the personified thunder-cloud, and in the seraph the personified serpent-like lightning.

קדוש קדוש קדוש with מלא כל־הארץ כבודו. Isaiah hears this antiphonal or hypophonal song of the seraphim, not merely to learn that endless worship of God is their blessed occupation, but it is with this doxology as with the doxologies of the Apocalypse: like the whole scene, its significance lies in its reference to the history of salvation. God is in Himself the Holy One קָדוֹשׁ, *i.e.* He that is separated; that is, from the world of the finite and also of sin, and who is exalted above it. His glory כָּבוֹד, as Oetinger and Bengel have formulated it, is His disclosed holiness, as His holiness is His inner glory. That God's holiness should become universally manifest, or what is the same thing, that His glory should become the fulness of the whole earth, is what was already brought into view in Num. xiv. 21 as the end of the work of God (cf. chap. xi. 9; Hab. ii. 14). This end of the work of God stands eternally present before God; and the seraphim also have it before them in its final completion as the theme of their song of praise. But Isaiah is a man in the midst of the history which is striving to this end; and the exclamation of the seraphim, as now thus precisely expressed, gives him the means of knowing to what it will eventually come on earth; and the heavenly forms which now present themselves visibly to him enable him to conceive the nature of the divine glory with which the earth is to become full. The whole Book of Isaiah bears traces of the impression of this ecstasy. The favourite name of God in the mouth of the prophet קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, is the echo of this seraphic *Sanctus;* and the fact that this name of God is already expressed in the discourses in chap. i. 2–iv. 5, and thus used by way of preference, is a further confirmation of the view that Isaiah is here narrating his first calling. All the prophecies of Isaiah bear this name of God on them as their stamp; it occurs thirteen times (and including chaps. v. 16 and x. 17, fifteen times) in chaps. i.–xxxix.; twelve times (and including chaps. xliii. 15, xlix. 7, cf. also lvii. 15, fourteen times) in chaps. xl.–lxvi.; and therefore twenty-nine times in all in the whole Book of Isaiah. On this Luzzatto remarks: "The prophet, as if foreseeing that the second part of his book would be denied to be his, has impressed the name of God, קדוש ישראל, as his seal on both parts, חתם חותמו בבילן." The word elsewhere occurs, apart

from Hab. i. 12, only three times in the Psalms (Ps. lxxi. 22, lxxviii. 41, lxxxix. 19), and twice in Jeremiah in two passages (chaps. l. 29, li. 5), which the hypothesis of interpolation regards as introductions of their Isaiah II. It belongs to Isaiah's peculiar prophetic signature, סנגן. Here we find ourselves at the very source of this phenomenon. Does the thrice holy indeed refer to God the Triune?[1] Knobel contents himself with remarking that the expression serves for strengthening. No doubt men are accustomed to say thrice what they wish to say exhaustively and satisfyingly; for the three is the number of disclosed unity. But why is this so? The Pythagoreans said that number is the principle of all things; but the Scripture, according to which God creates the world in twice three days by ten words of power, and completes it in seven days, teaches that God is the principle of all numbers. That the three is the number of unfolded and self-enclosed unity has its ultimate ground in this, that it is the number of the threefold being of God; and that being admitted, the Trisagion of the seraphim (as well as that of the cherubim in Rev. iv. 8) therefore applies in the consciousness of those spirits to God the Triune, and it is called in the language of the Church, not without right, *Hymnus Trinitatis.*

Isaiah, hearing this, stands enraptured at the farthest distance from Him that sat on the throne, namely, under the door of the heavenly palace or temple; and what he there further felt and saw is related by him in ver. 4: "*And the foundations of the thresholds shook at the voice of those who cried; and the house became full of smoke.*" By אַמּוֹת הַסִּפִּים the LXX. Jer. Syr. and others understand the posts of the lintels, the supporting beams of the מַשְׁקוֹף closing the door at the top (Mishn. שְׁקוֹף, Arab. سَكَفَة). This may be taken as correct; for that סִפִּים means not merely the thresholds, but also the horizontal beam which closes the framework of the door above, is proved by Amos ix. 1, where the

[1] Galatinus asserts that he saw a Targum in Lecce (a town in the Neapolitan province of the same name), in which the Trisagion was translated: קדישא אבא קדישא ברא קדישא רוח קודשא, doubtless an interpolation by a Christian hand.

command is given to smite the chapiters of the temple of Bethel that the סִפִּים may tremble, and to smash the upper beams, supported by the pillars, down upon the head of those assembled. Hence Böttcher's view (*Lehrb.* i. 428) recommends itself; he understands סִפִּים to mean the upper and lower threshold together, as distinguished from the upright door-posts. אמות, however, does not mean, as Nägelsbach holds, "the right-angled frames, like the bend of the arm" (for which no parallel can be quoted), but the basis of the upper beam; אַמָּה being related to אֵם as *matrix* to *mater*, and being used of the receiving basis (*e.g.* Talmudic אַמְתָּא דְּרֵחַיָּא, the frame or box of the hand-mill, *Berachoth* 18*b*, and אַמַּת מְנָרָה, the woodwork which runs along the back of the saw and holds it stretched, *Kelim* xxi. 3; cf. the German Scraubenmutter, literally, screw-mother or female-screw, which, with its hollowed windings, receives and holds the cylindrical screw).[1] As often as the choir of the seraphim began their song (הַקּוֹרֵא, cf. the collective singular הָאוֹרֵב, the ambush, in Josh. viii. 19; הֶחָלוּץ, the men of war, in Josh. vi. 7 and elsewhere; and הַמְאַסֵּף, the rearguard, in Josh. vi. 9 and elsewhere), the lower and upper crossbeams of the portal which Isaiah stood in shook. The building was seized, as it were, with devout awe. At the same time it was filled with smoke. Reference in this connection has been made to 1 Kings viii. 10; but there God attests His presence by the cloud of smoke behind which He conceals Himself, whereas here such a self-attestation was not required, nor does God dwell here in cloud and mystery; and the smoke is not represented as the effect of the presence of God, but of the songs of praise of the seraphim. The material for producing smoke on the altar of incense is thereby set on fire. From this point some light begins to fall upon the name שְׂרָפִים, which, when derived from a verb, שָׂרַף, in the sense of the Arabic *šarafa* (*šarufa*), to tower forth, to be set high, or highly honoured (Gesenius, Hengstenberg, Hofmann, Kurtz, Cheyne, Schultz, Bredenkamp), gives a sense which expresses

[1] Friedr. Delitzsch, *Proleg.* 107–110, carries back the cognate terms אֵם, אַמָּה, אָמָה to the fundamental notion of width (roominess), according to which אַמָּה in this passage would mean the holder which receives into it the beam or post.

little. On the other hand, to follow Knobel, who reads שָׂרָתִים, servants of God (Targ. שַׁפְשִׁין), would be a venturesome contribution of a new word to the lexicon. The verb שׂרף means *urere* and *comburere;* and if the name is explained therefrom, then the שׂרפים are fire-spirits of a burning nature, and efficient in setting on fire or burning away. And in any case there exists a connection between the name of these heavenly beings and the name of the serpents, שׂרפים, in Num. xxi. 6, especially as Isaiah himself uses שׂרף in chap. xiv. 29 as the name of a serpent. Why should not the seraphim be heavenly antitypes of that which the serpent was, which, apart from sin and the curse, belonged to the good creation of God, and even appears in Num. xxi. 6–9 as *ἀγαθοδαίμων* (cf. John iii. 14)? Like winged dragons, the seraphim hover round the throne of God as a crowning lustre. But it is only their being, which is invisible in itself to sensuous eyes, that thus makes itself visible to the seer.

At first, overwhelmed and intoxicated by the majestic spectacle, the seer now becomes conscious of himself. Ver. 5: "*Then I said, Woe to me, for I am lost; for a man of unclean lips am I, and I am dwelling among a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of Hosts.*" It is a fundamental view of the Old Testament that man cannot see God without dying (Ex. xix. 21, xx. 19, xxxiii. 20; Deut. xviii. 16; Judg. xiii. 22). He must die,—not, as Ritschl and Schultz, in their theory of sacrifice, suppose, as a creature standing at a deep distance from God, but as an impure one and a sinner,—because the divine holiness is for the sinner a consuming fire, chap. xxxiii. 14. But besides, it is true that the infinite distance between the Creator and the creature exercises of itself a prostrating effect, which even the seraphim cannot sustain without veiling their faces, but not a death-producing effect. Here, in Isaiah, the two facts meet: he is a man, and, moreover, a sinful man. Therefore, as he has come to see God, he regards himself as undone, annihilated (נִדְמֵיתִי, like *ὄλωλα, perii*, the preterite of the fact viewed as complete for the individual's consciousness); and so much the more since, as regards his own person, he is unclean of lips, and at the same time is a member of a people of unclean lips. The unholiness of his own person, in virtue of the solidarity of the

natural connection, is doubled by the unholiness of the people to which he belongs. This unholiness he calls uncleanness of lips, because he sees himself transported into the midst of choirs of beings who praise the Lord with clean or pure lips; and he calls Jehovah the King, for he has in fact not seen Jehovah face to face, but he has seen the throne, the all-filling talar, and the seraphim hovering around the enthroned One and doing Him homage.—He has therefore seen the heavenly King in manifest majesty, and he designates what was beheld by the impression he received. Here, however, to stand in sight of Jehovah of Hosts, the King exalted above all, to whom everything pays homage: to stand here and, in the consciousness of deep uncleanness, to be compelled to remain dumb—this excites in him the annihilating anguish of self-condemnation. And this finds expression in the confession which is made by the contrite seer.

This confession is followed by forgiveness of sins, which is guaranteed to him through a heavenly sacrament, and is appropriated as his through a seraphic absolution. Vers. 6, 7: "*And there flew to me one of the seraphim, with a glowing coal in his hand; with the tongs he had taken it away from off the altar. And with it he touched my mouth, and said: Behold, this has touched thy lips and away is thine iniquity, and thus thy sin is expiated.*" One of the seraphs hovering about the Lord flies to the altar of incense, the heavenly type of the golden altar of incense of the earthly tabernacle, which was reckoned as belonging to the Holiest of all, and in his hand a רִצְפָּה, which he had taken לָקְחָה=לָקַח, with tongs from the altar. רִצְפָּה is either a red-hot stone (Aq. S. Th. *ψῆφος*, Jer. *calculus*) from the structure of the altar, or a red-hot coal (LXX. *ἄνθραξ*). The Masora distinguishes scholastically[1] רִצְפָּה, mosaic pavement (see Norzi on Ezek. xl. 17),[2] and רִצְפָּה,

[1] Comp. Nöldeke, *Syrische Gramm.* p. 18. An analogous example is the distinction betweeen אִבְּ and אַבְּ, of which the former means a natural father, the latter a spiritual father (see Payne Smith, under אב).

[2] In the sense of burning coal or burning stone, רִצְפָּה is related to רִצְפִּים (עגה), 1 Kings xix. 6, as *n. unitatis*. Also in Arab. رَضْف (not

glowing coal; and the latter must be what is here meant, as the seraph would not have torn a stone out of the structure of the altar; and it is far from being natural to think of the heavenly altar as constructed of stones, according to the directions in Ex. xx. 25 (cf. Josh. viii. 31), which, moreover, refers to the altar of burnt-offering, and not to the altar of incense. With a pair of tongs he has taken it off from the altar, because even the seraph's hand does not immediately touch the structure consecrated to God, and the sacrifice belonging to God; and now he flies with this burning coal to Isaiah, makes it come into contact with his mouth (וַיַּגַּע, Hi. in the causative sense as in chap. v. 8; Ex. xii. 22), of whose uncleanness above the other members of the body he had complained (cf. Jer. i. 9, where the prophet's mouth is touched by Jehovah's hand, and is thereby made divinely eloquent), and assures him of the forgiveness of his sins, coincident with the application of this sacramental sign (cf. Zech. iii. 4). The ו connects as simultaneous what is said by נָגַע and סָר; the זֶה in the neuter refers to the burning coal; and תְּכֻפַּר is a mode of sequence separated from its ו, because the notion of the subject has to be made prominent. For it is really impossible that the removal of the guilt of sin is to be thought of as momentary and the expiation as taking place gradually: the very fact that the guilt of sin is done away, shows that the expiation is also completed. כִּפֶּר, with the accusative or עַל of sin, signifies to cover up, extinguish, or wipe out this sin (see for the fundamental meaning, chap. xxviii. 18), so that it has no existence for the punitive justice of God. The sinful uncleanness is burned away from the prophet's mouth. The seraph therefore does here by means of fire from the

רִצְפָּה) is the name used for the stone made red-hot, which serves for roasting by: it and the flesh, wrapped up in leaves, being covered over. Two verbal stems of the form רצף are to be distinguished. The one, from which is derived רִצְפָּה, *pavimentum*, means to lay firmly on or beside one another, Assyr. *raṣâpu* (whence, *e.g.*, *arṣip*, I erected, used of piling building-stones on one another), Arab. رصف, and the cognate word in Mishna, רצף, to join in rows, connect. The other meaning is to glow, Arab. رضف, cognate רשף. This distinction is correctly made by Mühlau-Volck. Stone, *calculus*, ψῆφος, as a part of the flooring, is a meaning erroneously adopted by Aquila and others.

altar, and therefore by means of divine fire, what his name denotes: he burns up, yet not in a destructive way, but in a wholesome way: he burns away as likewise from the elevated שָׂרָף in Num. xxi. 6–9, there proceeds a healing power which makes the deadly poison ineffective. As the smoke which fills the house comes from the altar, and arises in consequence of the adoration of the Lord on the part of the seraphim, the incense-offering upon the altar and this adoration are thus closely connected. A fire-glance of God, and, moreover, as the seraphim are sinless, a pure fire-glance of love, has kindled the sacrifice. Now, if the fact that a seraph by means of this love-fire purges the seer of sin, presents an example of the historical calling of the seraphim in relation to salvation, the seraphim are the bearers and mediators of the fire of divine love, as in Ezekiel the cherubim are the bearers and mediators of the fire of divine wrath. For as in this instance a seraph takes the fire of love from the altar, so in that case (Ezek. x. 6, 7) a cherub brings forth the fire of wrath from the throne-chariot; and the cherubim therefore appear as the bearers and mediators of the wrath which destroys sinners; or at least of the *doxa* which has its fiery side turned towards the world, as the seraphim appear as the bearers and mediators of the love which purges away sin, or of the *doxa* which is turned on its side of light to the world.[1]

After Isaiah is purged of sin, it becomes manifest what is the special purpose of the heavenly scene. Ver. 8: "*Then I heard the voice of the All-Lord saying: Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then I said: Behold me here; send me!*" According to Knobel, the plural לָנוּ is the plural of majesty, by which God frequently speaks of Himself in the Koran; but the Holy Scripture furnishes no certain example of this. It is rather the plural of inner reflection or of self-consultation (Hitzig), but the Biblical representation of the relation of the heavenly beings to the heavenly God decides for the view that the seraphim are included in the idea, as

[1] Seraphic love is the expression used in the language of the Church to denote the *ne plus ultra* of holy love in the creature. The Syriac fathers regarded the burning coal as the symbol of the incarnate Son of God, who is often designated in poetry as the "live or burning coal" (*ḳemurtâ denurâ*): *DMZ.* 1860, pp. 679, 681.

they form along with the Lord an assembled council (סוֹד קְדוֹשִׁים, Ps. lxxxix. 8), as in 1 Kings xxii. 19–22 ; Dan. iv. 14, and elsewhere (see comm. on Gen. i. 26). The mission for which the right man is sought is not only a divine mission, but generally a heavenly mission ; for it is not only a matter that concerns God that the earth shall become full of the glory of God, but it is also a thing incumbent on the spirits who serve Him. But Isaiah, whose longing to serve the Lord is no longer suppressed by the feeling of his sinfulness, has no sooner heard the voice of the Lord than he exclaims in holy self-consciousness : הִנֵּנִי שְׁלָחֵנִי.

There now follows the terms of the mission and the substance of the message. Vers. 9, 10 : "*He spake, Go and say to this people : Hear always, and understand not ; and but see ever and perceive not. Make the heart of this people greasy, and its ears dull, and its eyes sticky ; lest it see with its eyes, and hear with its ears, and its heart understand, and it be converted, and one bring about its healing.*" הָעָם הַזֶּה points back to the people of unclean lips, dwelling among which Isaiah had complained, and which the Lord cannot call עַמִּי (cf. Judg. ii. 20 ; Hagg. i. 2). He is called to go to this people and to preach to it, and therefore he is called to be the prophet of this people. But how sad does the divine commission sound ; it is the terrible opposite of the seraphic mission which was experienced by the prophet in himself. The seraph had purified Isaiah from sin by the burning coal, in order that he now as prophet may not purify his people from sin, but harden them by his word. They are to hear and see, and, moreover, as the added intensive infinitives say, on and on, by having the prophetic preaching *actu directo* always before them, but not to their salvation. The two prohibitives אַל־תָּבִינוּ and אַל־תֵּדָעוּ express what, according to God's judicial will, is to be the result of the prophetic preaching. And the imperatives in ver. 10 commission the prophet not merely to say to the people what God has determined ; for the proposition *saepe prophetae facere dicuntur quae fore pronunciant* (for which reference is made to Jer. i. 10, cf. xxxi. 28 ; Hos. vi. 5 ; Ezek. xliii. 3) has its truth not in a rhetorical figure, but in the very nature of the divine word. The prophet is the organ of the divine word, and the divine word is the

comprehension of the divine will, and the divine will is an intra-divine act, a divine act that has only not yet become historical. For this reason it may be said that the prophet executes what he proclaims as future: God is the *causa efficiens principalis*; the word is the *causa media*, and the prophet is the *causa ministerialis*. There are three figurative expressions for hardening: הַשְׁמֵן, to make fat, *pinguem, i.e.* to make without feeling for the operations of grace (Ps. cix. 7); הַכְבֵּד, to make heavy, and especially heavy or dull of hearing (chap. lix. 1); הַשַּׁע or הֵשַׁע (whence *impcr.* הָשַׁע, also *in p.* הָשַׁע), to spread thickly, to smear over, to do to any one what happens to diseased eyes when their sticky secretion during the night becomes a closing crust (from שָׁעַע, syn. טוּחַ or טָחַח, chap. xliv. 18; Arab. كحل, *illinere collyrium* in the sense of *occaecare;* related to שׁוּעַ, with which טחח is translated in the Targum). The three future clauses with פֶּן point back in the inverse order to the three demands. Spiritual sight, spiritual hearing, spiritual feeling are to be taken from them, their eyes becoming blind, their ears deaf, and their hearts covered over with the grease of insensibility. Ruled by these imperfects, the two preterites שָׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ say what might have been the result, but what will not be the result, if this hardening had not taken place. רָפָא לְ is always elsewhere used transitively (*e.g.* Hos. vii. 1), for to heal any one or to heal a disease, and never subjectively, to become whole; here it gets a passive sense through the so-called impersonal construction, "and one heal it = and it be healed," according to which it is paraphrased in Mark iv. 12, whereas the three other New Testament quotations of it (in Matthew, John, and Acts) reproduce the καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς of the LXX. The commission which the prophet receives, sounds as if it were quite incompatible with the fact that God as the Good only wills the good. But it is not only God's will of love that is good, but also His will of wrath, into which His will of love is transformed when He is obstinately rejected. There is a self-hardening of man in evil which makes him absolutely incorrigible, and which is not less a judicial infliction of God than self-produced guilt of man. The two are involved in each other, sin bearing its punishment already essentially in itself, as a punishment which consists in the wrath of God

excited by it. Israel has delivered itself over to this wrath by obstinate sinning. Hence the Lord now closes the door of repentance to His people. But that He nevertheless has repentance preached to the people through the prophet, takes place because the judgment of hardening, while decreed upon the mass of the people, is yet not without the possibility of the saving of individuals.

Isaiah has heard with sighing, but with obedience, what the mission to which he has so joyfully offered himself is to consist in. Ver. 11*a*: "*Then I said, How long, All-Lord?*" He asks how long this service of hardening and this state of hard-heartedness were to continue,—a question which his sympathy with the people to which he himself belongs forces from him (cf. Ex. xxxii. 9–14), and one which is justified by the certainty that God, who is faithful to His promise, cannot cast off Israel as a people for ever. The divine answer follows. Vers. 11–13: "*Until cities are made desolate, without inhabitants, and houses without men, and the ground shall be laid waste, a wilderness, and Jehovah shall remove men far away, and there shall be many forsaken places within the land. And if there is still a tenth therein, this is again given up to extermination; like the terebinth, and like the oak, of which, when they are felled, there only still remains a root-stock—a holy seed is such a root-stock.*" The answer intentionally begins, not with עַד־כִּי, but with עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם (which is only elsewhere found in Gen. xxviii. 15 and Num. xxxii. 7),—an expression which, without dropping the conditional אִם, means that the end of the judgment of hardening is only coming after the condition is realized that the cities, houses, and soil of the land of Israel and its surroundings have been first laid waste (pret. and imperf., thus in the sense of *fut. ex.* as in chap. iv. 4; cf. Num. xxiii. 24); and, moreover, utterly and thoroughly as the three successive accompanying determinations declare (without inhabitants, without men, wilderness). רְחַק is a still wholly vague designation of the exile (cf. Joel iv. 6; Jer. xxvii. 10), for which chap. v. 13 already presents the proper designation in using גָּלָה. Instead of some national designation, the expression here employed is general, אֶת־הָאָדָם, along with the process of depopulation, its consequence, the lack of men, being thus expressed. Like וְרַבָּה וְרֻחַק is also a *perf.*

consec. with accent on the last syllable (Olsh. p. 482); and הָעֲזוּבָה, "the forsaken," embraces the idea of places which were formerly full of life, with the life now extinct and fallen into ruins (chap. xvii. 2, 9). This judgment will be followed by a second, which will also subject the remaining tenth of the people to a sifting; שָׁב וְהָיָה, to become again (Ges. § 142, 3); הָיָה לְבָעֵר, not as in chap. v. 5, but as in chap. iv. 4, after Num. xxiv. 22, the feminine refers to the tenth. Up to לְבָעֵר the announcement is a threatening one; but from that point up to בָּם a comforting prospect already begins to dawn, which in the last three words lines the horizon of this gloomy announcement like a distant streak of light. It will fare with them as with the terebinth and the oak. These trees, with which a multitude of associations from the early times of Israel were connected (see on Gen. xii. 6), have (like certain others, as, for instance, the beech, the nut tree, and the alder) the property of renewing themselves again from the root-stump even when their trunk has been felled. As the forms יַבֶּשֶׁת (dryness), דַּלֶּקֶת (fever), עִוֶּרֶת (blindness), שַׁחֶפֶת (consumption) designate certain conditions, and especially faulty ones, so שַׁלֶּכֶת is not the throwing down or felling as an act, but the condition of a tree which is thrown down or hewn down: the state of fallenness, not (which would here be too little) that of defoliation (Targum) or of the falling of the fruit from the stalk (Syr.). Perhaps also the name of the gate of the temple, שַׁעַר שַׁלֶּכֶת, points to trees which formerly stood there, and had been felled down. אֲשֶׁר ··· בָּם goes together *in quibus*; ב has its primary significance of cleaving to something. Of the felled terebinth or oak, deprived of its trunk and its crown, there is still a מַצֶּבֶת (collateral form of מַצֵּבָה); *i.c.* there is a root-stock, *truncus* (a *cippus*, which the word otherwise signifies, but it is a natural cippus, and capable of shooting), fast fixed in the ground,—an image of the remnant surviving the judgment, which becomes a זֶרַע קֹדֶשׁ from which a new Israel shoots out after the old Israel is exterminated. In a few weighty words the way is thus sketched upon which God will henceforth go with His people. It presents an outline of the history of Israel to the end of time. It is repeated in Zech. xiii. 8, 9, where instead of the tenth we have a third, and they are therefore both to be taken as the symbolical

designation of a fraction, but not as its arithmetical measurement. Israel as a people is imperishable in virtue of divine promise; but the mass of the people is henceforth destined for destruction in virtue of a divine decision, and only a remnant which is converted will finally propagate Israel's prerogative as a people, and inherit the glorious future.

Now, if the impression which we have received from vers. 5–8 is not a false one,—namely, that the subject of chap. vi. is the inaugural vision of the prophet, and not his calling *ad unum specialem actum officii*, as Sebastian Schmidt holds,—this impression will be verified by the fact that the discourses in chaps. i.–v. do not merely give a picture of the state of the people ripening for the fatal event in chap. vi., as Strachey holds, but that these discourses already contain the elements here conveyed to the prophet in the way of a revelation, and that the prophet is there already found executing his fateful commission. The impression also actually stands the application of this test. For the very first discourse, after it has shown to the people as such the gracious way of justification and sanctification, takes in the consciousness of its being all in vain, the turn indicated in chaps. xi.–xiii. The theme of the second discourse is that it will only be after the overthrow of the false glory of Israel that the promised true glory will be realized, and that after the extermination of the mass of the people, only a small remnant will live to experience its realization. The parable with which the third discourse begins, rests upon the supposition that the measure of the sin of the people is full, and the threatening of judgment which is introduced by this parable agrees actually, and in part verbally, with the divine answer received by the prophet to his question, עַד־מָתַי. From all sides, therefore, we have the view confirmed, that Isaiah in chap. vi. relates his consecration as a prophet. The discourses in chaps. ii.–iv. 5, which belong to the time of Uzziah and Jotham, do not fall earlier than the death-year of Uzziah, from which date the whole time of Jotham's sixteen years' reign is open for them. Now Micah appeared on the scene under Jotham; but his book, by working up the proclamations he delivered in the time of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, has taken the form of a chronologically indivisible summary, which, as we may learn from Jer. xxvi.

18, he recited or published in the time of Hezekiah; and hence Isaiah may thus quite well have taken the word of promise in chap. ii. 1–4 (certainly borrowed from some source) from Micah's lips, though not from Micah's book.

Further, the position of chap. vi. is not inexplicable. Hävernick has already observed that the prophet in chap. vi. is justifying, on the ground of a divine commission, the manner and style of his previous proclamation. But this only serves to explain the intention from which chap. vi. was not made to stand at the commencement of the collection, and not why it is found exactly in this and no other place. Prophecy and fulfilment are brought together; for, on the one hand, chap. vii. brings manifestly forward the judgment of hardening suspended over the Jewish people in the person of king Ahaz; and, on the other hand, we find ourselves in the middle of the Syro-Ephraimitish war, which forms the transition to the judgments of extermination prophesied in chap. vi. 11–13. It is only the position of chap. i. which still remains obscure. If the verses chap. i. 7–9 are meant to have a historical reference to the times, then chap. i. was composed when the danger of the Syro-Ephraimitish war was averted from Jerusalem, while the land of Judah was still bleeding from the opened wounds which this war, aimed at its annihilation, had inflicted upon it. Accordingly chap. i. is more recent than chaps. ii.–v., and also more recent than the connected chaps. vii.–xii. It is only the comparatively more indefinite and general character of chap. i. which seems to tell against this view. This objection, however, is removed, if we assume that chap. i. is not, indeed, the first spoken discourse of the prophet, but the first of his discourses that was written down, and that it was primarily designed to form the proëmium to the discourses and historical narrations in chaps. ii.–xii., the contents of which are ruled by it.[1] For chaps. ii.–v. and vii.–xii. are two cycles of prophecy; chap. i. is the portal which leads into them, and chap. vi. the band which connects them

[1] A different view is taken by v. Hoffman (*Hermeneutik*, herausgeg. von Volck, p. 133), who regards chap. i. as the preface to chaps. ii.–xxxv. Nägelsbach again holds chaps. i. 2–v. 6 to be the threefold introitus of the whole book in its two divisions, chaps. vii.–xxxix., xl.–lxvi., and chap. i. to be the portion of the collection which was written last.

together. The cycle of prophecy in chaps. ii.–v. may, with Caspari, be called the *Book of hardening*, and chaps. vii.–xii., after the example of Chr. Aug. Crusius, may be called the *Book of Immanuel.* For in all the stages through which the proclamation in chaps. vii.–xii. passes, the future Immanuel is the banner of consolation which the proclamation lifts up amid the judgments which are now breaking in, in consequence of the doom pronounced in chap. vi.

PART II.—CONSOLATION OF IMMANUEL IN THE ASSYRIAN OPPRESSIONS, CHAPS. VII.–XII.

The Divine Sign of the Wondrous Son of the Virgin, Chap. VII.

As the following prophecies cannot be understood without reference to the contemporary historical events into which they entered, the prophet begins historically. Ver. 1: "*It came to pass in the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, the king of Judah, that Rezin, the king of Aram, and Pekah, the son of Remaliah, the king of Israel, went up towards Jerusalem to war against it; and was not able to war upon it.*" We read the same words again, only a little varied, in the history of the reign of Ahaz in 2 Kings xvi. 5. That the author of the Book of Kings takes them from the Book of Isaiah, is betrayed by the fact that he interprets them. Instead of "and he was not able to war upon it," he says particularly: "and they besieged Ahaz, and could not war upon him." The singular יָכֹל in Isaiah is transformed into the simpler plural; and the fact that the two allies could not assault or storm Jerusalem (which must be the meaning of נִלְחַם עַל here) is more exactly determined by saying that they vainly besieged Ahaz (צוּר עַל is the usual expression for *obsidione claudere*, cf. Deut. xx. 19). This *et obsederunt Ahazum* cannot merely mean *obsidere conati sunt*, although we know nothing in detail about this siege, and 2 Kings xvi. 5, from the secondary relation of this passage to Isa. vii. 1, cannot be regarded as a historical source. But happily we have

two accounts regarding the Syro-Ephraimitish war, in 2 Kings xvi. and 2 Chron. xxviii. The Book of Kings relates that the incursion of the two allies into Judah began already at the end of the reign of Jotham (2 Kings xv. 37); and apart from the statement taken from Isa. vii. 1, it mentions that Rezin reconquered for Edom the port of Elath which belonged to the kingdom of Judah (in 2 Kings xvi. 6 read לאדם instead of לארם); and the Book of Chronicles relates that Rezin brought a multitude of Jewish captives to Damascus; and that Pekah conquered Ahaz in a bloody battle, in which his forces were destroyed. However unquestionable the credibility of these events is, yet it is as difficult to bring them into an indubitably certain connection in relations of fact and chronology, as Caspari has attempted to do in a monograph on the Syro-Ephraimitish war, published in 1849. If we could assume that 1*b*, יָכֹל (not יוּכַל), is the authentic reading, and that the thwarting of the attempt to take Jerusalem, related here, had its ground, not in the intervention of Assyria, but in the strength of the city,—so that accordingly 1*b* would not be an anticipation of the ultimate thwarting of the whole undertaking, although such summary anticipations are in the manner of the Biblical mode of writing history, and likewise also in the manner of Isaiah,—then the course of events might be so represented that while Rezin marched to Elath, Pekah wished to deal with Jerusalem, but did not attain his purpose; but that Rezin was more successful in his easier undertaking, and that after the conquest of Elath he joined his allies.

It is this which may thus be taken to be referred to in ver. 2: "*And it was told the house of David: Aram has settled down upon Ephraim,—then his heart shook, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest shake before the wind.*" The נוּחַ עַל indicates here the coming down of the one army after the other in order to strengthen it; whereas ver. 19, 2 Sam. xvii. 12 (cf. Judg. vii. 12), indicates a hostile attack, and 2 Kings ii. 15, a spiritual *καταβαίνειν*. אֶפְרַיִם (feminine, like the names of countries, and of the peoples thought along with their countries, see chap. iii. 8), as the name of the chief stock of Israel, is used as the name of the whole kingdom, and here of the whole military power of Israel. Following

the combination indicated above, we find that the allies now prepared themselves for a second united march against Jerusalem. In the meantime, Jerusalem was in the condition indicated in chap. i. 7–9 : like an invested city in the midst of a land overrun by a plundering enemy setting everything on fire. Elath had fallen, as Rezin's opportune return from it showed ; and it was quite natural, humanly regarded, that in the face of his approaching junction with the united army of the allies, the court and people of Jerusalem should tremble like aspen leaves. וַיָּנַע is a contracted impf. *Qal* ending in *a*, not in short *o*, on account of the guttural, as in וַיָּנַח, Ex. xx. 11, and such like ; and נוֹעַ, otherwise the form of the *infin. abs.* chap. xxiv. 20, is here and only here inf. constr. instead of נוּעַ (cf. נוֹחַ, Num. xi. 25 ; שׁוֹב, Josh. ii. 16 ; מוֹט, Ps. xxxviii. 17, and frequently).

In this time of terror, Isaiah received the following divine instructions. Ver. 3 : " *Then said Jehovah to Isaiah, Come, go out to meet Ahaz, thou and Shear-Jashub, thy son, to the end of the aqueduct of the upper pool by the road of the fullers' field.*" The fullers,[1] *i.e.* cleaners and thickeners of woollen stuffs, received as workmen the name כְּבָסִים from כָּבַס, related to כָּבַשׁ, كبس, *subigere*, which is related to רָחַץ, as πλύνειν, likewise specially used in reference to clothes washing, is related to λούειν. The שְׂדֵה כוֹבֵס, so called as being their washing and bleaching place, lay, as Robinson, Schultz, von Raumer, Thenius, Unruh, Schick, and most expositors hold, upon the western side of the city. Zimmermann, in his maps and plans of the topography of ancient Jerusalem (1876), places the two great pools on the west of the city, the lower pool and north-west therefrom the Mamilla pool, eastward from which in the same line lies the Hezekiah pool, through which an aqueduct led the water of the upper pool to the upper city. On the other hand, Williams, Kraft, Meier, and Hitzig transfer the upper pool with the fullers' field to the north-east of the city, beside the monument of the fuller (Joseph.

[1] In the Aramaic of the Talmud and Targums the fuller is called קַצָּר, as in Arab. we have also *ḳaṣṣâr* and *miḳṣar*, the cylindrical round fuller's club, which, according to Hegesippus (in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23), was the instrument by which James the Just was beaten to death. A כובס appears in the controversial dialogue with a Christian in *Sanhedrin* 38*b*.

Wars, v. 4. 2). But Rabshake encamping by the upper pool (chap. xxxvi. 2) comes from Lachis, and therefore from the south-west. Furrer (in the *Bibel-Lex.* ii. 464) also recognises the Mamilla-pool as the "upper pool in the fullers' field." Explorers have not yet succeeded in discovering a living spring on the west side;[1] both pools were probably even in former times only fed by rain, for catching which the lie of the land is very favourable.[2] If the upper pool was the Mamilla-pool, then the road מְסִלָּה, which ran past this fullers' field, was the road which led from the western gate to Joppa. Here in the west of the city, outside the enclosing wall, king Ahaz now found himself engaged in preparations for the event of a siege of Jerusalem, which received the most part of its water supply from the upper pool; and here, according to Jehovah's direction, Isaiah with his son was to meet him. These two are like a blessing and curse in person, offering themselves to the king for him to make his choice. For the name שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב, *i.e.* remnant is converted (chap. x. 21, 22), is a kind of abbreviation of the divine answer which had been given to the prophet in chap. vi. 11–13, and is, moreover, at once threatening and promising, but in such a way that it has the curse, as it were, before it, and the grace behind it. The prophetic name of the son of Isaiah is intended to urge the king by threat to Jehovah, and the prophetic announcement of Isaiah himself, whose name points to salvation, יֵשַׁע, is designed to entice him by promise to Jehovah.

No means remain untried. Ver. 4: "*And say to him, Take heed, and keep thyself quiet; fear not, and let not thy heart become soft from these two smoking stumps of firebrands,— at the burning anger of Reṣin and Aram, and the son of Remaliah.*" The imper. "take heed" is regularly pointed הִשָּׁמֶר (see especially, Ex. xxiii. 21; Job xxxvi. 21), and thus הִשָּׁמֶר וְהַשְׁקֵט will accordingly be infinitives absolute in the sense of urgent imperatives (Hitzig): take heed, and keep at rest!=

[1] Schick believed he had discovered it in 1865 about ten minutes' walking distance from the Jaffa gate; see Ausland, Nr. 38, 1865.

[2] This is entirely different from the Gihon, a running, although intermittent spring, probably the same as the Mary-spring at the east foot of Ophel, and therefore in the eastern side of the city.

be on your guard, and do not act precipitately, rather keep at rest. The first is a warning against self-willed acting; the latter is an exhortation to undismayed equanimity. Calvin correctly renders it: *ut et exterius contineat sese et intus pacato sit animo.* The explanation given by Jewish expositors of הִשָּׁמֶר, *conside super faeces tuas* (Luzzatto, *vivi riposato*), according to Jer. xlviii. 11 and Zeph. i. 12, gives an unseemly sense to the exhortation. The object of terror before which and at which the king's heart is not to be dismayed, is first introduced with מִן, and then with בְּ, as in Jer. li. 46. The two allies are at once designated as what they are before God, who sees through things in the future. They are two tails, *i.e.* nothing but the fag ends of wood pokers (אוּד, properly turners, namely, fire-turners, an Arabic figure for a warrior, Ges. *Thes.* p. 157*b*),[1] half-burned off and wholly burned out, so that they do not burn any longer, but only still keep smoking. Certainly they are not this yet at the time in question as regards outward reality, where, as בַּחֲרִי does not conceal, their anger has not yet been long kindled, but they are such before God, who makes the prophet cognisant with Himself of His counsel. Along with רְצִין (in cuneiform inscriptions *Rasûna*[2]), in order not to honour it with the name of a king, אֲרָם is specially named, and Pekah is called בֶּן־רְמַלְיָהוּ, to recall the lowness of his descent, and the want of any promise in the case of his house.

The יַעַן כִּי which now follows does not belong to ver. 4, as might appear in consideration of the Sethume after it (fear not on this account that), cf. Ezek. xii. 12, but it gives the motive of the following sentence of judgment as in chap. iii. 16. Vers. 5–7: "*Because that Aram has resolved evil against thee, Ephraim, and the son of Remaliah, saying, We will march against Judah, and strike it with terror, and conquer it for ourselves, and make the son of Tabel king in the midst of it: thus saith the All-Lord Jehovah, It shall not come about, and not take place.*" The promise to Ahaz is founded upon the wicked design with which the war has been begun. How far the allies had already advanced on the way to their

[1] Cf. Schwartzlose, *Waffen der alten Araber*, p. 32.

[2] Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2nd ed. 1883, p. 260 sqq.

ultimate goal, the overthrow of the Davidic kingdom, it does not say. But we know from 2 Kings xv. 37 that the invasion had already begun before Ahaz had ascended the throne, and we may see from ver. 16 of Isaiah's prophecy that the נְקֹיטָה (from קוּץ, *taedere, pavere*, for which the Syrian translator has נְקַצָּה from קָצַץ, *abscindere*) had been successfully attained. The הַבְקִיעַ, *i.c.* cleaving, forcing of the passes and fortification (2 Kings xxv. 4 ; Ezek. xxx. 16 ; 2 Chron. xxi. 17, xxxii. 1) can therefore not be regarded as pertaining to the future. For history knows nothing whatever of a successful resistance of Judah in this war. Only Jerusalem has not yet fallen, and this, as מֶלֶךְ בְּתוֹכָהּ shows, is what is specially referred to under יְהוּדָה, just as אַשּׁוּר in chap. xxiii. 13 refers to Nineveh. Here they intend to appoint as king a favourite named טַבְאֵל[1] (see Ezra iv. 7, *in p.* intentionally טָבְאַל, a vocalic change which the tone-long *ē* of אֵל does not otherwise admit; cf. *DMZ.* xxxiii. 30, but which here separates the name of God from the name of "this good-for-nothing fellow"); but the intention remains a mere wish, the thing wished does not come about (cf. Prov. xv. 22), and is not realized (cf. Zech. xiv. 8).

The allies will not succeed in altering the course of history as the Lord has ordered it. Vers. 8–9: "*For head of Aram is Damascus, and head of Damascus Resin, and in other sixty and five years Ephraim will be broken to pieces as a people. And head of Ephraim is Samaria, and head of Samaria the son of Remaliah; if ye believe not, verily you will not remain.*" It naturally occurs to regard 8*b* as a later interpolation (Eichhorn, Gesenius, Hitzig, Maurer, Knobel, Meier, Dietrich, Cheyne, Reuss). The prophecy here becomes divination, and one might hold that an indefinite expression of the near future would have been more effective than this fixing of a considerably distant terminus, and it is, in fact, probable that instead of וּבְעוֹד שִׁשִּׁים וְחָמֵשׁ שָׁנָה there stood in the original text the expression of what was only but a short delay (chap. xvi. 14, xx. 3, xxi. 16), and that a later hand glossed the unprecise expression by a reference to the history of the

[1] The name has not yet been traced out in the cuneiform inscriptions; see Schrader, *u.s.* p. 384, and comp. his *Keilinschriften u. Geschichtsforchung*, p. 396.

fulfilment of the prophecy. If 8*b* be left out, the whole idea is only this, that the two hostile powers will remain in their previous relationships without an annexation of Judah. If 8*b* is retained (under the supposition of such a phrase as "within a short time" instead of the "within sixty-five years"), then 8*a* and 9*a* similarly say that the old condition of things will remain; but 8*b* states that while Syria gains nothing, Ephraim, which had become involved in an unnatural and irreligious league with it, will lose its national independence, and 9*b*, that Judah, although Samaria's attempt to take away its independence fails, yet if it gives up its trust in Jehovah and makes flesh its arm, it will have no continuance, *i.e.* will lose its national independence. Ver. 8*b* is a prophecy announcing the destruction of Ephraim; 9*b* is a warning, threatening Judah with destruction in so far as it rejects the promise from unbelief. The colour of the style of 8*b* is entirely Isaianic (cf. on בָּעוֹר, chap. xxi. 16, xvi. 14; and on מֵעָם, away from being a people = so that it is no more a people, cf. chap. xvii. 1, xxv. 2, and Jer. xlviii. 2, 42). But it cannot be asserted that the sixty-five years are false, and that they are in contradiction with chap. vii. 16. Certainly they do not come out if we refer the prophecy to what happened to Ephraim in consequence of the Syro-Ephraimitish war carried on by Tiglath-Pileser, and to what was done to it by Salmanassar in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign, to which events, and more especially to the former, chap. vii. 16 relates. But there is another event through which the existence of Ephraim, not merely as a kingdom, but also as a people, was broken, namely, the carrying away of the last remnant of the Ephraimitish population, and the planting of East Asian colonists upon the soil of Ephraim. While the land of Judah remained desolate after the deportation to Chaldea, and a new generation grew up there, which, being in exile, might again return, the land of Ephraim was occupied by heathen settlers, and the few who remained behind were fused with these into the mixed people of Samaritans, those in exile being lost among the heathen. This is the view which was already held by Malvenda, Calmet, and Usher as to the *terminus ad quem*. Bosanquet reckons the sixty-five years from the year 736 as the con-

jectural date of the meeting of Isaiah with Ahaz, and as extending to 671, founding upon the fact that even after the fall of Samaria, a kingdom of Samaria continues to be always mentioned in the inscription, but it is found for the last time in one that dates from 681 to 673. This calculation by the Assyrian monuments has, however, meanwhile become doubtful by more correct reading of them. Nevertheless the fact remains that the populating by Esarhaddon (2 Kings xvii. 24, Ezra iv. 2, and his successor Asnappar = Asurbanipal, Ezra iv. 10) of the land of Ephraim with colonists from Eastern Asia is the fulfilment of the יֵחַת מֵעָם; and if it was Esarhaddon under whom Manasseh was carried away to Babylon about the middle of his reign (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11), then we get just sixty-five years from the second year of the reign of Ahaz to the final ending of the existence of Ephraim as a people (fourteen years of Ahaz + twenty-nine of Hezekiah + twenty-two of Manasseh = sixty-five). Then was fulfilled what is here unconditionally predicted, יֵחַת מֵעָם (certainly not 3 *impf. Qal*, but *Ni.* נָחַת, Mal. ii. 5), just as the conditionally threatened לֹא תַאֲמִנוּ was fulfilled on Judah by the Babylonian exile. For נָאֲמַן signifies to have a fast hold, and הֶאֱמִין to prove fast holding. If Judah does not *hold fast* to his God, he will lose his *fast hold* by losing the country in which he dwells, the ground beneath his feet. The same play on words is found in 2 Chron. xx. 20. The suggestion that the original reading was אם לא תאמינו בי, but that בי appeared objectionable and was altered into כִּי, is improbable.[1] Why should it have been objectionable when the words form the conclusion of a solemnly introduced direct discourse of Jehovah? On this כִּי, which has passed from the confirmative into an affirmative meaning, and here opens the consequence of the hypothetical clause, cf. 1 Sam. xiv. 39; Ps. cxxviii. 4; and (as used in the formula כִּי עַתָּה) Gen. xxxi. 42, xliii. 10; Num. xxii. 29, 33; 1 Sam. xiv. 30. Their continuance is conditioned by faith, as this כי surely asserts.[2]

[1] Geiger in *DMZ.* 1861, p. 117, and previously in the Review הַהִלּוּךְ, 1860, p. 89.

[2] It is worth quoting what Augustine remarks on this subject in his *De doctrina Christiana*, ii. 11: *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis* [so LXX. and Itala]. Alius [Jerome] interpretatus est: *Nisi credideritis, non per-*

Thus Isaiah speaks, and thus Jehovah speaks through him, to the king of Judah. We are not informed as to whether he replied or what he replied. He is silent, for in his heart he hides a secret which consoles him better than the word of the prophet. The invisible assistance of Jehovah and the distant prospect of the fall of Ephraim are not sufficient for him. His mind is already made up. His trust is in Assur (Assyria), with whose help he will be superior to the kingdom of Israel, as that kingdom had been to the kingdom of Judah through the help of Damascene Syria. The pious theocratic policy of the prophet comes too late. He therefore lets the enthusiast talk, and thinks he knows what it is worth at the best. Nevertheless, the grace of God does not give up the unhappy son of David as lost. Vers. 10, 11 : "*And Jehovah continued to speak to Ahaz as follows: Ask thee a sign from Jehovah thy God, going deep down to Hades or high up to the height above.*" Jehovah continued,—what a deep and firm consciousness of the identity of the word of Jehovah and the word of the prophet is expressed therein! It occurs also in chap. viii. 5. According to an astonishing *communicatio idiomatum* which runs through the Old Testament books of prophecy, the prophet speaks at one time (as, *e.g.*, in Zech. ii. 13 and 15) as if he were Jehovah, and at another time, as in this passage, Jehovah speaks as if He were the prophet. Ahaz is to ask a sign from Jehovah his God. Jehovah does not scorn to call Himself the God of this son of David who so hardens himself. Perhaps the holy love which pulsates in this אֱלֹהֶיךָ may yet move his heart; or perhaps he may reflect upon the covenant promises and covenant duties

manebitis. Quis horum vera secutus sit, nisi exemplaria linguae praecedentis legantur, incertum est. Sed tamen ex utroque magnum aliquid insinuatur scienter legentibus. Difficile est enim ita diversos inter se interpretes fieri, ut non se aliqua vicinitate contingant. Ergo quoniam intellectus in specie sempiterna est, fides vero in rerum temporalium quibusdam cunabulis quasi lacte alit parvulos, nunc autem per fidem ambulamus, non per speciem, nisi autem per fidem ambulaverimus, ad speciem pervenire non poterimus, quae non transit, sed permanet per intellectum purgatum nobis cohaerentibus veritati: propterea ille ait: *Nisi credideritis non permanebitis.* Ille vero: *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis.* Et ex ambiguo linguae praecedentis plerumque interpres fallitur, cui non bene nota sententia est, et eam significationem transfert, quae a sensu scriptoris penitus aliena est.

which this אלהיך recalls to mind. He is to ask for a אות from this his God. אות (from אָוָה, to indicate) is a thing, event, or act which may serve to guarantee the divine certainty of some other thing, event, or act. This happens partly through sensible miracles presently performed (Ex. iv. 8, 9), or through fixed symbols of the future (chap. viii. 18, xx. 3), and partly through prophesied events, which, whether miraculous or natural in themselves, are not to be humanly foreseen; and therefore if they occur, they authenticate either the divine causality of other events retrospectively (Ex. iii. 12), or their divine certainty prospectively. The thing to be here guaranteed is what the prophet has just prophesied with great definiteness: the preservation of Judah with its kingdom, and the fruitlessness of the wicked enterprise of the two allied kingdoms. If this was to be guaranteed to Ahaz in a manner that would break down his unbelief, it can only be done by a sign, אות, which breaks through the regular course of nature. As Hezekiah, when Isaiah announces his recovery and a prolongation of life for fifteen years, requires a אות, and the prophet gives him it (chap. xxxviii.), so does Isaiah here meet Ahaz with the offer of such a sign, and, moreover, by laying before him heaven, earth, and Hades as the sphere of the miracle. הַעְמֵק (הַעֲמֵק) and הַגְבֵּהּ are either *infin. abs.* or *imper.*, and שְׁאָלָה is apparently *imper.*: שְׁאַל with the *He* of challenge, which is given here instead of שְׁאָלָה as שְׁאָלָה (as likewise elsewhere with distinctive accents, as in Dan. ix. 19, and even without any pause in xxxii. 11, *q.v.*); but in no case do we need to read, with Hupfeld, שְׁאָלָה with the tone upon the last, in the sense of שְׁאֵלָה; and thus: *in profundum descende* (or *deseendendo*) *precare*. But שְׁאָלָה may also be a pausal collateral form for שְׁאֹלָה, which is allowable in itself (cf. יֶחֱפָץ, always in *p.* for יַחְפֹּץ, and other examples, Gen. xliii. 14, xlix. 3, 27),[1] and here it appears to be preferred on account of its consonance with לְמַעְלָה (Ewald, § 93. 3). We give the preference to this latter possibility, with Aq. Sym. Theod. Jer. (*βάθυνον*

[1] The passing of the *o* into *ā* (*å*) likewise produces the infinitive form לְמַשְׁחָךְ, 1 Sam. xv. 1; לַהֲרָגָךְ (according to Norzi), 1 Sam. xxiv. 11; עָמְדָךְ, Obad. ver. 11. On corresponding imperative forms, see on chap. xxxviii. 14.

εἰς ᾅδην), against the Targum; it corresponds to the antithesis (cf. Job xi. 8), and if the words before us were unpointed, this would first suggest itself. The challenge, accordingly, amounts to this: Descend down deep (in thy asking) to Hades, or ascend high up to the height; but more probably (as the closer construction is more pleasing, and הגבה as imper. would be well distinguished from the inf. by the form הַגְבֵּהּ, cf. הַרְקֵח, Ezek. xxiv. 10, with a gerundive acceptation of העמק and הגבה, Ewald, § 280*a*): going deep down to Hades, or אוֹ, from אָוָה, as *vel*, from *velle*) going high up to the height. This offer of the prophet of any kind of miracle in the upper or lower world cannot but perplex the adherents of the modern view of the world. The prophet, says Hitzig, is here playing a dangerous game, and if Ahaz had closed with the offer, Jehovah would certainly have left him in the lurch. So Meier observes: it cannot have at all come into the mind of an Isaiah to wish to do a miracle. And de Lagarde says: If he had done it, he would have been an enthusiast whom the failure of such a אות would have subjected to punishment for lying, or whom an artificial performing of it would have made a deceiver. None of these commentators can recognise the miraculous power of the prophet, because they do not at all believe in miracles; whereas Ahaz knows the miraculous power of the prophet, but is not to be constrained by any miracle to renounce his own plans and believe on Jehovah. Ver. 12: "*But Ahaz answered, I may not ask, and may not tempt Jehovah.*" How pious this sounds, and yet his self-hardening culminates in these pious-sounding words! Hypocritically he hides himself under the mask of Deut. vi. 16, in order not to allow himself to be disturbed in his Assyrian policy, and he is so unthinking as to call the acceptance of what Jehovah Himself offers him a tempting of God. He studiously draws down upon himself the fate indicated in chap. vi.; and not merely upon himself, but upon all Judah. For under the successor of Ahaz, the host of Assyria will stand upon this same fullers' field (chap. xxxvi. 2), and demand the surrender of Jerusalem. In this hour when Isaiah stands before Ahaz, the fate of the Jewish people is decided for more than two thousand years.

The prophet might now be silent, but in accordance with

the command in chap. vi. he must speak, although his word be a savour of death unto death. Ver. 13: "*He spake, Hear, then, O house of David: Is it too little for you to make men weary, that ye also weary my God?*" He spake. Who spake? The speaker, according to ver. 10, is Jehovah, and yet what follows is given as the word of the prophet. Here again the statement proceeds on the assumption that the word of the prophet is the word of God, and that the prophet himself, even when he distinguishes himself and God, is the organ of God. The address is directed to בֵּית דָּוִד, *i.e.* to Ahaz, including all the members of the court. אֲנָשִׁים is the plural of the category, and by it the prophet indicates himself. The prophet would, indeed, well have borne that those of the house of David should yield no results to his zealous human efforts, but they are not satisfied with this (cf. on the expression *minus quam vos = quam ut vobis sufficiat*, Num. xvi. 9; Job xv. 11); they also weary the long-suffering of his God by letting Him exhaust all the means of their correction without effect.[1] They will not believe without seeing; and when signs are about to be given them to see in order that they may believe, they will not even look at them.

Jehovah, then, will give them a sign against their will after His own choice. Vers. 14, 15: "*Therefore the All-Lord, He will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin*[2] *is with child, and bears a son, and calls his name Immanuel. Butter and honey will he eat when he knows to reject the bad and to*

[1] Perhaps תלאו and אלהי form an intended enantiophony; see the collection of examples in the Review ההלין, Jahrg. 2 (1853), pp. 94–99.

[2] [As will be seen by what follows, "virgin" is not strictly the correct rendering of עַלְמָה, according to Dr. Delitzsch's own view; but as he retains *Jungfrau* in the German, it has been thought better in like manner to retain the usual English term rather than introduce "damsel," "maid," or "maiden." Cheyne renders הָעַלְמָה, "the young woman," "so Hitzig, R. Williams, Nägelsbach, and (in effect) Gesenius;" gives the rendering of Ewald and Delitzsch (*Jungfrau*) as "the maiden;" and quotes the late Professor Weir of Glasgow as retaining "virgin," while observing: "But the Hebrew, strictly speaking, does not correspond to our 'virgin.'" Dr. Kay in his comm. on Isaiah in the *Speaker's Commentary, s.l.*, says: "Our English word "maiden" comes as near, probably, as any to the Hebrew word." "Or *maiden*" is added in the margin of the Revised Version. Prof. Drever remarks: "Probably the English word *damsel* would be the fairest rendering" (*Isaiah*, p. 41).—Tr.]

choose the good." In its form the prophecy recalls Gen. xvi. 11: "Behold, thou art with child, and wilt bear a son, and call his name Ishmael." Here, however, the words are not addressed to her who was afterwards to bear the child, although Matthew gives this form to the prophecy;[1] for קָרְאִת is not 2 *p.* but 3 *p.* = קָרְאָה (ground form *kara'at*, which occurs for קָרָת, "it takes place," Deut. xxxi. 29; cf. Gen. xxx. 11; Lev. xxv. 21; Ps. cxviii. 23).[2] The question as to whether the clause is to be translated: Behold, the virgin is with child, or shall be with child, ought not to have been raised. הנה with the following participle (here participial adjective; cf. 2 Sam. xi. 5) is always presentative, and the thing presented is always either a real thing, as in Gen. xvi. 11 and Judg. xiii. 5; or it is an ideally present thing, as is to be taken here; for except in chap. xlviii. 7, הֵנָּה always indicates something future in Isaiah. This use of הנה in Isaiah is of itself opposed to the view of Gesenius, Knobel, Friedmann (*De Jesaiae vaticiniis Achaso rege editis*, 1875), S. Davidson, and others, who understand הָעַלְמָה to apply to the already pregnant young wife of the prophet, and who, like Raven (see on chap. viii. 3) and Reuss, identify Immanuel and Mahershalal.[3] But it is already very improbable that it is the wife of the prophet who is meant; for if he meant her, one cannot well see why he did not rather say הַנְּבִיאָה. Further, the meaning and use of עלמה are against the reference of the אות to the prophet's own household. For while בְּתוּלָה (from בָּתַל, related to בָּדַל, to separate, *sejungere*) signifies the virgin maiden living retired in her parents' house, and still a long while from marriage (Assyr. has also *batûlu*, a youth), עַלְמָה (from עָלַם, to be strong, full of sap and vigour, arrived at the age of puberty, ✓ על, غل, to swell) is the

[1] Jerome discusses this difference in an exemplary manner in his *Ep. ad Pammachium de optimo genere interpretandi.*

[2] The pointing makes a distinction between קָרְאִת (she calls) and קָרָאתְ (as Gen. xvi. 11 should be pointed), thou callest (see Abenezra's *Zachoth*, 7*a*, and Jekuthiël ha-Nakdan on Gen. xvi. 11); and Olshausen (§ 35*b*) is wrong in pronouncing the latter form of writing the word a mistake.

[3] Another view is taken by the expositor to whom Jerome refers: Quidam de nostris Judaizans Esaias duos filios habuisse contendit Jasub, et Emmanuel. Et Emmanuel de prophetissa uxore ejus esse generatum in typum Domini salvatoris, etc.

mature woman who is near marriage.[1] Both names may be applied to a female who is betrothed or even married (Joel i. 8; Prov. xxx. 19; see Hitzig on these passages). It must also be admitted that the idea of immaculate virginity is not necessarily connected with עלמה (as in Gen. xxiv. 43, cf. 16), since in such passages as Song of Sol. vi. 8 it can hardly be distinguished in sense from the Arab. *Surrîya*. It must also be admitted that it might be said of one who has a still youthful fresh wife, that he has a עלמה for his wife; but it is inconceivable that in a religiously earnest and well-weighed style a woman who has been already for a long time married, like the prophet's wife, could be called absolutely העלמה without qualification.[2] On the other hand, the expression warrants the assumption that the prophet by העלמה means one of the עֲלָמוֹת of the royal harem (Luzzatto); and if we consider that the birth of the child in the view of the prophet is to take place in the near future, his look might have been directed to that *Abijah* (*Abî*) *bath-Zechariah* (2 Kings xviii. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 1) who became the mother of king Hezekiah, to whom the virtues of his mother appear to have been transmitted in contrast with the vice of his father. But while the expression might admit this view, reference to Hezekiah and his mother is excluded by the fact that he was born to the young king Ahaz before his accession to the throne, and therefore he cannot be meant either here or

[1] Vercellone, in a lecture (in his *Dissertazioni accademiche*, Roma 1864), has defended at considerable length the assertion of Jerome: *Hebraicum* עלמה *nunquam nisi de virgine scribitur, significat enim puellam virginem absconditam;* but his defence is untenable. The root is not עלם, to conceal, according to which Aq. translates Gen. xxiv. 43, ἀπόκρυφος. Luther, in 1523, expressed himself to better effect thus: "Well, then, to oblige the Jews, we shall not translate the word *Alma* as virgin, but as a maid, although in German maid means a woman who is still young, and wears her crown with honour, so that it is said: she is still a maid and not a wife. Thus, then, the text of Isaiah is most properly translated: Behold, a maid is with child." In fact, the translation ἡ νεᾶνις (Aq. S. Th.) is more exact than ἡ παρθένος (LXX. Syr.). In medieval sermons Christ is called "the son of the maid."

[2] A young and newly-married wife might be called כַּלָּה (as in Homer, νύμφη = *nubilis* and *nupta;* Eng. *bride*); but even in Homer a married woman, if young, is sometimes called καυριδίη ἄλοχος, but not κούρη νεῄνις).

in chap. ix. 5.[1] But, in any case, even if the prophet thought of one of the עלמות of the then royal house, the child thus prophesied of is the Messiah, that wondrous heir of the Davidic throne whose birth is exultingly greeted in chap. ix. It is the Messiah whom the prophet here beholds as about to be born, then in chap. ix. as born, and in chap. xi. as reigning,—three stages of a triad which are not to be wrenched asunder, a threefold constellation of consoling forms, illuminating the three stadia into which the future history of his people divides itself in the view of the prophet. Or is העלמה no determinate person at all, or not any single person? Duhm asserts that wife and son are merely representative ideas; and Reuss holds that by the virgin is meant *la femme comme telle*. Kuenen thinks that some particular woman of the time was meant; and Henry Hammond as early as 1653 expounded this view, maintaining that the prophecy has found in Jesus Christ a fulfilment which goes beyond its immediate sense, that in its primary sense pregnancy, birth, and maturity are only parabolical facts subservient to the chronological measurement of time. But all this is opposed by the address in chap. viii. 8, which demands a definite and highly significant personality. And, further, the view is not to be accepted which holds that the house of David is the עלמה, and that her son is a future new Israel (Hofmann, Ebrard, Köhler, Weir); for while it is true that in contrast to the widowhood of the community of Israel a youthful age of it, עֲלוּמִים, is spoken of in chap. liv. 4 (cf. Jer. ii. 2), yet the community of Israel is never absolutely called הָעַלְמָה or הַבְּתוּלָה, and the text is here thoroughly individual in its reference, and does not point to a

[1] According to 2 Kings xvi. 2, Ahaz on ascending the throne was twenty years old, and according to 2 Kings xviii. 2, Hezekiah on his ascending the throne was twenty-five years old. Now, as, according to 1 Kings xvi. 2, Ahaz reigned sixteen years, he thus died in his thirty-sixth year, and would thus have to be regarded as father of Hezekiah when eleven years old. According to the LXX. and Pesh., in 2 Chron. xxviii. 1 he was twenty-five years old on ascending the throne, and therefore died when forty-one years old, so that Hezekiah, according to this reckoning, would have been born to him in his sixteenth year. This might have been possible. But however Hezekiah's accession to the throne may be regarded (see the tables on pp. 32–33), the result is always reached that Hezekiah was already born when his father succeeded to the government (cf. Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 40).

twofold *persona moralis*. The prophet would have said בַּת־צִיּוֹן; עלמה in this kind of personification is unheard of, and the house of David, as then before the view of the prophet, was not at all deserving of such a designation. There is therefore no other alternative left but to accept the view that the prophet means by העלמה a particular virgin, and one, moreover, belonging to the house of David, as the Messianic character of the prophecy desiderates. She who is meant is the same as is named by Micah v. 2, יוֹלֵדָה. It is the virgin whom God's spirit presents before the prophet, and who, although he cannot name her, yet stands before his soul as selected for something extraordinary (cf. the article in הַנַּעַר in Num. xi. 27 and similar passages). How exalted this mother appears to him, is seen from the fact that it is she who gives the son his name, the name עִמָּנוּאֵל (here to be written as one word).[1] The purport of this name is purely promissory. But if we look at the לָכֵן and the occasion which preceded it, the אות can be no mere promise and no pure promise; we expect (1) that it will be an extraordinary fact which the prophet announces, and (2) a fact with a threatening presentative side. Now a humiliation of the house of David is already included in the fact that the God it will not recognise nevertheless shapes its future as the emphatic הוּא says: He (*αὐτός*) from His own impulse and out of His own choice. But this shaping of the future must also be as threatening for the unbelieving house of David as it is promising for the believers of Israel. And the threatening of the אות cannot be to be sought exclusively in ver. 15, seeing that both לָכֵן and הִנֵּה transfer the central bearing of the אות to ver. 14; and further, the externally unconnected addition of ver. 15 shows that what is said in ver. 14 is the main thing, and not conversely. In ver. 14, however, a threatening element of the אות can only lie in this, that it is not Ahaz and not a son of Ahaz, or generally of the house of David as then hardening itself, through whom God saves His people, but that a nameless virgin of humble rank, whom God has chosen, and whom He shows to His prophet in the mirror of His counsel, will bring forth the divine deliverer of His

[1] See on this the tractate *Sofrim* iv. *Halacha* 8, and pp. 67, 68 of the edition by Joel Müller, 1878.

people in the midst of the impending tribulations. And by this it is indicated that He who is the pledge of the continued existence of Judah does not come until the present degenerate house of David, which is bringing Judah to the brink of destruction, is removed even to the stump (chap. xi. 1).

But now comes the further question, Wherein consists the extraordinary characteristic of the announced fact? It consists in this, that according to chap. ix. 5, Immanuel Himself is a פֶּלֶא,—He is God in bodily self-presentation. If, however, the Messiah is עִמָּנוּאֵל in the sense that, as the prophet in chap. ix. 5 (cf. chap. x. 21) expressly says, He is Himself אֵל, His birth must also be a wonderful or miraculous one. The prophet, it is true, does not say that the עלמה whom no man has yet known will bear Him without that happening, so that He is born not so much out of the house of David, as into it, a gift of heaven; but this העלמה was and remained in the Old Testament an enigma or mystery, powerfully inciting to the *ἐρευνᾶν* mentioned in 1 Pet. i. 10–12, and waiting for its solution in a historical fulfilment. Thus the אות is on the one side a mystery staring threateningly at the house of David, and on the other side it is a mystery rich in comfort to the prophet and all believers; and it is couched in such enigmatic terms in order that they who harden themselves may not understand it, and in order that believers may so much the more long to understand it. It is the result of the self-hardening of Ahaz, that the אות withdraws itself from his comprehension, just as the proclamation of the kingdom of heaven, according to Matt. xiii. 10–17, was wrapped in the veil of parable to the benefit of the disciples, but for the punishment of the hardened masses.

In ver. 15 the threatening element of ver. 14 then becomes alone predominating. It would not be so if thickened milk and honey were meant here, as the usual food of the tenderest age of childhood (as maintained by Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and others). But the reason on which it is grounded in the following verses, 16, 17, conveys another view. Thickened milk and honey, the food of the desert, will be the only provisions which the land will furnish in the time contemporaneous with the ripening youth of Immanuel. חֶמְאָה (from חָמָא, חמא, to be thick, clotted) is butter including the

cream (both included in Arab. سمن), as נְבִינָה means cheese including the curd. The object to ידע is expressed in vers. 15, 16 by *inf. absoluti* (cf. the more usual mode of expression in chap. viii. 4). The ל in לרעתו is that of time (Spurrel on Gen. iii. 8); it is used in a somewhat vaguer manner than עַד, as in לָקָצִיר, Amos iv. 7; לַבֹּקֶר, Deut. xvi. 4, where all the three parallel passages, Ex. xii. 10, xxiii. 18, Num. ix. 12, have עַד; לְפֶרֶשׁ in Lev. xxiv. 12 is a designation of the *terminus ad quem*, as it also interchanges in reference to space in Ps. lix. 14 with עַל and עַד. The incapacity to distinguish between bad and good belongs characteristically to the age of childhood (Deut. i. 39 and elsewhere), and to old age when it relapses into childish ways (2 Sam. xix. 36). The commencement of the capacity to distinguish things is equivalent to entering into the so-called *anni discretionis*, into the riper age of conscious free self-determination. The notion implied in the expression is not purely ethical, and therefore the ל is not to be taken as the ל of purpose. By the time when Immanuel has advanced to this age, all the blessings of the land will be reduced to this, that a land full of luxuriant cornfields and vineyards would have turned into a great wooded pasture land, only furnishing milk and honey and nothing more. The fact that אֶרֶץ זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבַשׁ is used in the Torah as the characteristic designation of Canaan, ought not to disturb this view. The desolation of the land is the reason of the limitation of Immanuel to that most simple and uniform kind of food, a food which is also most meagre and insipid when compared with the fat of wheat and the exhilaration of wine.

This limitation thus finds its reason in vers. 16, 17; there are two successive and causally connected events which bring about that universal desolation. Vers. 16, 17: "*For before the boy shall understand how to reject the evil and choose the good, laid waste will be the land before whose two kings thou art in terror. Jehovah will bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father's house, days such as have not come since the day when Ephraim tore himself from Judah—the king of Assur.*" The land of the two kings, Syria and Israel, is first devastated by the Assyrians who are called hither by Ahaz.

Tiglath-Pileser conquered Damascus and a part of the kingdom of Israel, and took away a large portion of the inhabitants of both regions into captivity (2 Kings xv. 29, xvi. 9). Judah is then also devastated by the Assyrians as a punishment for having scorned the help of Jehovah and having preferred their human help. Days of misfortune will come upon the royal house and the people of Judah, such as (אֲשֶׁר, *quales*, as in Ex. x. 6) have not come upon them since the days of the calamity of the falling away of the ten tribes (לְמִיּוֹם with prefixed לְ, the vague expression of direction in time, as in Judg. xix. 30; 2 Sam. vii. 6; for which elsewhere is also used לְמִן־הַיּוֹם, with following infin., Ex. ix. 18; 2 Sam. xix. 25). The calling in of Assur laid the foundation for the overthrow of the kingdom of Judah not less than for that of the kingdom of Israel. Ahaz thereby became a tributary vassal of the Assyrian king, and although Hezekiah again became free from Assyria through the miraculous help of Jehovah, nevertheless what Nebuchadnezzar did was only the accomplishment of the frustrated undertaking of Sennacherib. אֵת מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר stands with incisive force at the end of the two verses. The אֵת is frequently placed where to an indefinite object is appended the more particularly defined object (Gen. vi. 19, xxvi. 34). Cheyne thinks that the closing words את מלך אשור weaken the energy of the expression, and that their ultra-distinctness betrays the fact of their being an interpolation. Like Knobel and others, he rejects them as a gloss. But even if במלך אישור in ver. 20*a* be a gloss, here the words appear to me to be like the arrow point of vers. 16, 17. The very king to whom Ahaz has recourse in his terror will bring Judah to the brink of destruction. Besides, the entirely loose unconnected succession of ver. 17 after ver. 16 is very effective. The hope which ver. 16 gives rise to in Ahaz, is suddenly transformed into bitter deception. In the view of such catastrophes, Isaiah prophesies the birth of Immanuel. At the time when he will understand aright what is good and bad, he will eat only thickened milk and honey; and this fact has its reason in the desolation of the whole of the old territory of the Davidic kingdom which will precede his maturer youth, when he would choose other kinds of food if they were to be found. Consequently the birth of Immanuel in the vision of the prophet occurs in

the interval between that present time and the Assyrian oppressions, and his earliest childhood runs parallel with the Assyrian oppressions. In any case, their consequences are still lasting during the time of his riper youth. This cannot be taken away from the prophecy; nor does Bredenkamp (who takes לדעתו as determining a purpose "in order that he may know what Ahaz has not known: to reject the evil and to choose the good") succeed thereby as he intends in separating the birth of Immanuel from being interwoven with the Syro-Ephraimitish war. We shall afterwards see how, notwithstanding this involvement, the truth of the prophecy nevertheless continues to exist.

What now follows in vers. 18–25 is only the development in detail of ver. 17. The promising side of the אות remains in the background. In the presence of Ahaz the promise must be dumb. So much the more eloquent is the threatening of judgment expressed from ver. 18: "*And it comes to pass in that day, Jehovah shall hiss for the fly that is at the end of the Nile-arms of Egypt, and the bee that is in the land of Assur; and they come and settle down all of them in the valleys of the declivities, and in the clefts of the rocks, and in all the thorn thickets, and in all the meadows.*" The prophet already said in chap. v. 26 that Jehovah would hiss for distant peoples, and now he is able to name them by name. Bees and swarms of flies are also used as a Homeric image for swarms of peoples, *Il.* ii. 87: ἠΰτε ἔθνεα εἰσὶ μελισσάων ἀδινάων, and 469: ἠΰτε μυιάων ἀδινάων ἔθνεα πολλά. Here the images are likewise emblematic. The Egyptian people, being unusually numerous, is compared to the swarming fly (זְבוּב, ذُبَاب, from ذَبَّ, to move much and inconstantly hither and thither); and the Assyrian people, being warlike and eager for conquest, is compared to the stinging bee, which is so difficult to turn away (Deut. i. 44; Ps. cxviii. 12); דְּבוֹרָה from דבר, נבר, to be behind one another, to follow one another, drive, swarm. The emblems also correspond to the nature of the two countries; the fly to slimy Egypt, which, from being such, abounds in insects (see chap. xviii. 1),[1] and the bee to the more moun-

[1] Egypt abounds in midges, gnats, gadflies, and especially *muscariae*, including a species of small flies (ناموس, so called from their humming,

tainous and woody Assyria, where bee-culture still constitutes one of the principal branches of trade in the present day. יְאֹר, pl. יְאֹרִים, is a name of the Nile and of its arms; the word is Egyptian (*yaro*, with the art. *phiaro*, plur. *yarôu*), but also Semitic (Friedr. Delitzsch, *Hebr. Language*, p. 25). The end of the Nile-arms of Egypt, from a Palestinian point of view, was the farthest corner of the land. The army of Egypt marches out of the whole extent of the country, meets with the Assyrian army in the Holy Land, where both settle down (וְנָחוּ, according to the Masoretic evidence, *Milra*, like וגעו, chap. xix. 1; ונכו, Lev. xxvi. 36, and other instances), and cover it in such a way that נַחֲלֵי הַבָּתּוֹת, the valleys of steep overhanging heights (cf. on chap. v. 6), and נְקִיקֵי הַסְּלָעִים, clefts of the rocks, all נַעֲצוּצִים, thorn hedges, and נַהֲלֹלִים, pastures (from נָהַל, according to the Assyr., related to הֵנִיחַ, הִרְבִּיץ, to make to couch, to bring to rest), are covered over with their swarms. Just such places are named as afford the flies and bees suitable shelter and abundance of nourishment, and this shows the faithfulness to nature with which the figure is depicted. If we look at the historical fulfilment, it also corresponds to the literal terms of the prophecy; for no collision of the Assyrian and Egyptian forces took place in the time of Hezekiah; and it was not till the time of Josiah that a collision took place between the Chaldean and Egyptian powers in the eventful battle fought between Pharaoh-Necho and Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish, which was decisive for the fate of Judah. That the spirit of prophecy points to this eventful occurrence, is shown in ver. 20, where there is now no further reference to Egypt, because it succumbed to the Eastern Asian empire.

Ver. 20: "*In that day the All-Lord will shave with a razor that is for hire on the banks of the river, with the king of Assur, the head and the hair of the legs; and also the beard will it take away.*" Knobel takes the hair-growth as figurative of the vegetable produce of the country; but the allegation that the flora, as the hair-covering of the soil, is a Biblical representation, has only limited support in the use of נֵזֶר as a name of

DMZ. xii. 701, 702, Anm. 3), and they are a great plague to men in the whole region of the Nile (see Hartmann, *Naturgeschichtlich-medicinische Skizze der Nilländer*, p. 204 f., 1865). The wasp is found as a hieroglyphic sign, in Lower Egypt (see Ebers, *Aegypten und die Bücher, Mose's* i. 73 f.).

the uncultivated vine left to itself (Lev. xxv. 5).[1] The people of Judah are viewed here, as chap. i. 6, as a stripped and naked man, who has not only the hair of his head and parts (רַגְלַיִם, euphemistically of the place where the two legs separate) shaved off, but, what is most shameful of all, also the hair of his beard, which is the sign of manly vigour, manliness, and manly dignity. For this purpose the All-Ruler uses a razor, which is more exactly designated as *conductitia in litoribus* (see on בְּעֶבְרִי, 1 Sam. xiv. 4), *Euphratis* (נָהָר here instead of הַנָּהָר), and yet more precisely as the king of Asshur, although this במלך אשור may be an elucidative addition not belonging to the original text.[2] הַשְּׂכִירָה might mean, as the genitive of a neuter, *conductitii*, or of an abstract term, *conductionis*, as it seems to have been so taken by the accentuation; but we take it rather adjectively: with a razor, that is to say, that which is for hire in the regions on both sides of the Euphrates—the king of Asshur. תַּעַר is *masc.* in Num. vi. 5, but may be *fem.* in the same way as תַּנּוּר in Hos. vii. 4, and as תְּהוֹם and תֵּבֵל, with same nominal prefix *ta*, always is; and that it is thus understood here is shown by תִּסְכְּפֶה. The verb סָכַף has here its proper meaning, to shave off, *radere* (cf. סְכִיף, *abstergere*, whence סְפוֹג, *σπόγγος*, *σφόγγος*, a sponge), which also takes on the special sense of scraping together, gathering in. In הַשְּׂכִירָה there is involved the bitterest sarcasm for Ahaz; the cheap knife which he had hired for the deliverance of Judah is hired by the Lord in order to shave Judah wholly and most shamefully.

[1] In the Arabic (Persian and Turkish) we frequently find the hair of the head compared to long leaves (*DMZ.* vii. 373), to the foliage of vines (de Sacy, *Chrestom.* iii. 54), or to the branches of palms (Amrulkais, *Muall.* v. 33). In the classical usage, figurative terms like *κόμη*, *φόβη*, *coma* (*caesaries*) are commonly applied to woods and trees. In the Mishna, *Peah* ii. 3, the branches of two trees beating on each other are designated שֵׂעָר כּוּתִּי.

[2] العبر also signifies the tract along the banks of a river (as the place for عبور, passing over), and *κατ' ἐξ*, that of the Euphrates, the whole tract of land stretching from the east bank of the Euphrates to the Tigris, and from the west bank to the Arabian desert (*berrîjet-el-'arab*), from which, according to the Turkish Kâmûs and *Lex geographicum*, ii. 232–3, is derived *'Ibri* or *'Ibrâni*, the name of the Jewish people, as having come from the land stretching from the bank of the Euphrates to the Tigris.

Thus shaved Judah is a depopulated and desert land, in which men nourish themselves no longer by cultivating corn and wine, or by trade and commerce, but exclusively by the rearing of cattle. Vers. 21, 22: "*And it will come to pass in that day that a man keeps a little cow and a couple of sheep. And it comes to pass, on account of the quantity of the milk produce, he will eat cream, for butter and honey shall every one eat who is left within the land.*" The former prosperity has gone down even to scantiest housekeeping. One man keeps carefully alive (חַיָּה, like הַחַיָּה elsewhere) a diminutive milch cow (only a heifer, for the strongest and finest of the cattle that are full grown have fallen as spoil to the enemy) and two head of smaller animals. שְׁתֵּי, not שְׁנֵי, because two female sheep or goats in milk are meant, and all the same this is enough; there are but a few men now in the country, and since all the land is pasture, the few beasts give milk in abundance; for, as a rural proverb says, "the cow is milked through the mouth." Bread and wine are unprocurable. Whoever has escaped the Assyrian razor eats thickened milk and honey; this, and nothing but this, without change *ad nauseam;* for the hills, formerly covered with vines and corn-fields, are now overgrown with thorns.

The prophet repeats this three times in vers. 23–25: "*And it will come to pass in that day, every place where a thousand vines stand at a thousand silver pieces, thorns and thistles will it become. With arrows and with bows will men go; for the whole land will become thorns and thistles. And all the hills which are wont to be hoed with the hoe, thou wilt not go to them from fear of thorns and thistles; and it becomes a gathering place of oxen, and a treading place of sheep.*" The אֶלֶף כֶּסֶף, *i.e.* 1000 shekels of silver, recall to mind Song of Sol. viii. 11; but there that is the value of the yearly produce. Here the thousand shekels are the value of a thousand vines, the designation of a peculiarly valuable bit of vineyard. In the present day the value of a vineyard in Lebanon and Syria is still reckoned according to the value of the separate vines, and usually one vine is reckoned as worth one piastre, a little more than twopence each, just as in Germany a Johannesberg vine is valued at a ducat. Every piece of land where such precious vines stand will become a prey to thorny brushwood. People go

there (יָבוֹא שָׁמָּה, retraction of the tone, with following Milel)[1] with arrow and bow, because the whole ground will have become thorns and thistles (see on chap. v. 6*a*), and therefore wild beasts will make their abode among them. And thou,—thus does the prophet address the dweller in the country,—thou comest not to all the hills which have been hitherto most carefully cultivated,[2] thou comest not to them in order to make them again fertile, from fear (יִרְאַת in the accusative = מִיִּרְאַת) of thorns and thistles, *i.e.* because the thick undergrowth frightens thee from attempting to reclaim such a fallow. Jerome, Vitringa, Ewald, and others interpret otherwise: *timor veprium non veniet illue*, but לֹא־תָבוֹא שָׁמָּה has a personal meaning; if יראת were the subject, the expression would have been תָּבוֹאֶם. Thus, then, they give the oxen free course there, and let what grows be trodden down by sheep and goats. The description is intentionally tautological and pleonastic, heavy and dragging. It aims at giving the impression of a waste heath, of a dull uniformity. Hence the repetitions of הָיָה and יִהְיֶה. In vers. 23–25, whatever is intended as historically future may be also in every case translated by the future; the impf. יִהְיֶה־שָּׁם, ver. 23*a*, expresses the condition of things at the breaking in of the devastation ("where when this breaks so and so many vines will stand"); only יעדרון in ver. 25*a* has not a future, but a present signification; not *sarrientur*, and still less *sarriebantur*, but *sarriuntur*, as expressing the cultivation going on at present. The indefinite subject of וְהָיָה in ver. 25*b* is all that lies round about.

Thus far does the discourse of Isaiah to king Ahaz go. He does not say expressly when Immanuel will be born, but only what will have happened before he enters upon the riper years of boyhood: namely, first the devastation of Israel and Syria, and then the devastation of Judah itself by the Assyrians. But when he represents Immanuel as eating thickened milk and honey as well as all those who survive the Assyrian oppressions in the Holy Land, he manifestly beholds and thinks of the childhood of Immanuel as coinciding with the time of the Assyrian calamities. In such a

[1] In the Codices the remark is expressly made on יבוא: ב׳ בטעם לעיל יהושע בן נון, *i.e.* twice occurring as Milel, here and in Deut. i. 38.

[2] Compare the reminiscence in the Mishna, *Peah* ii. § 2.

combined perspective view of events which lie far apart, consists what Chr. A. Crusius has designated the complex character of the prophecy.[1] The ground of this complex character of it is the human limitation attaching to the far look of the prophet, which limitation the Spirit of God allows to exist and makes subservient to Himself. If we cleave to the letter of the prophecy, it is possible on account of its complex character to find fault with its truth; but if we look upon the substance of what it contains, it will be found that its truth is not thereby destroyed. For the things which the prophet sees together are also essentially connected although not in time. If Isaiah here, in chaps. vii.–xii., looks upon Assyria absolutely as the universal empire (cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 29; Ezra vi. 22), this is so far true, seeing that the four empires from the Babylonian to the Roman are really only the unfolding of the beginning which had its beginning in Assyria. And if, here in chap. vii., he thinks of the son of the virgin as growing up under the Assyrian oppressions, this is also so far true, since Jesus was actually born in a time in which the Holy Land, deprived of its earlier fulness of blessing, found itself under the supremacy of the universal empire, and in a condition which went back to the unbelief of Ahaz as its ultimate cause. Besides He, who in the fulness of time became flesh, does truly lead an ideal life in the Old Testament history. The fact that the house and people of David did not perish in the Assyrian calamities is really, as chap. viii. presupposes, to be ascribed to His presence, which, although not yet in bodily form, was nevertheless active. Thus is solved the contradiction between the prophecy and the history of its fulfilment. We do not need to have recourse to the expedient of Bengel, Schegg, Schmieder, and others, who hold that the אות consists in an event just about to happen, which points typically to the birth of the real Immanuel; nor do we require the expedient of Hofmann, who takes the words of the prophet as an emblematic prophecy of the rise of a new Israel which will come to spiritual understanding in a troublous

[1] Ed. König (*Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.* ii. 388, 389, 1882) thinks this subject can be more correctly formulated thus: "God makes what was announced by prophecy separate itself in reality into different stages."

time, due to the want of understanding in the Israel of that present time. Rather is the view of Vitringa, Haneberg, Reusch, Vilmar, and others to be adopted, namely, that the prophet makes the stages in the life of the Messiah of the far future to be time-measures of the events of the immediate future. This he actually does; but in prophesying, without holding the birth of Immanuel to be an event of the distant future, he combines him who is seen in vision with the approaching tribulations. Far sight and near sight are combined with each other in his prophecy; the prophecy is divine within human limits.

Two Signs of the Immediate Future, Chap. VIII. 1–4.

In the midst of the continued turmoils of the Syro-Ephraimitish war, Isaiah receives God's instruction to perform a peculiar prophetic action. Vers. 1, 2: "*Then Jehovah said to me, Take thee a large tablet, and write thereon in common legible lines: In speed trophies, booty hastens.*[1] *And I will take for me trustworthy witnesses: Uriah the priest and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah.*" The tablet (cf. iii. 23, where the same word signifies a metal mirror), perhaps a smoothed tablet of wood, is to be large, in order to produce the impression of its being monumental; and the writing upon it is to be חֶרֶט אֱנוֹשׁ, the stylus of the people, *i.e.* writing in the usual popular character, consisting of inartistic lines easily read (cf. Rev. xiii. 18, xxi. 17). What is to be written is introduced with ל of dedication, as in Ezek. xxxvii. 16, or, more generally, of relation, as, *e.g.*, in Jer. xxiii. 9. But as it is not a personal name which the ל introduces, but a thing, לְמַהֵר will have to be taken, as Luzzatto does, for *fut. instans*, according to Gen. xv. 12; Josh. ii. 5; Hab. i. 17 (see remark upon it) = *acceleratura sunt spolia*, spoils are about to be hastened. Most of the commentators confuse the nature of the thing by taking these words at once as the name of a person (Ewald, § 288*c*); they are not yet this at the outset, but only become such afterwards. At first they are an oracular announcement of what is future: trophies, booty, are at hand,—but who is the conquered one? Jehovah and

[1] [Maher-shalal-hash-baz.]

His prophet, although not initiated into the policy of Ahaz, know. But their knowledge is intentionally shrouded in the veil of mystery. For the inscription is not to predict anything to the people. It is only to be a means whereby publicly to announce that the course of events was one that was foreknown and pre-indicated by Jehovah. Accordingly, when what is said by the inscription on the tablet occurs, men will know that it is the fulfilment of this inscription, and therefore an event predetermined by God. On this account Jehovah takes to Himself witnesses. It is not necessary to read either וְאָעִידָה, with Knobel and others (and I got to testify), nor וְהָעִידָה, with LXX. Targ. Syr. Hitzig (and get to testify). The relation is the same as with אָרִיק instead of הָרֵק in Ezek. v. 3. Jehovah says what He will do, and the prophet knows without its being necessary to be told him that it was to be done instrumentally through him. Uriah is doubtless the same person who afterwards set himself to serve the heathen desires of Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 10 sqq.). Zechariah ben Jeberechiah (Berechiah), of the same name as the post-exile prophet, was perhaps the Asaphite mentioned in 2 Chron. xxix. 13. The two are reliable witnesses as being persons of high distinction whose testimony is of great authority with the people. Accordingly, when the history of the time itself solves the enigma of that inscription, these two will tell the people how long before it had been written down by the prophet as such.

In the meantime something occurred whereby the place of the dead tablet was taken by a more eloquent living one. Vers. 3, 4: "*And I approached the prophetess; and she conceived, and bear a son. Then said Jehovah to me: Call his name Swiftly—Trophies—Booty hastens; for before the boy will learn to cry my father and my mother, they will carry the property of Damascus and the trophies of Samaria before the king of Assur.*" How entirely different does ver. 3 sound from chap. vii. 14! The נביאה is not the עלמה there; for if the son of the virgin is the Messiah, he is born into the house of David, and not into the house of the prophet. Besides, the prophet has already a son from his young wife, and she was no longer עלמה.[1] To his son Shearjashub, in whose name the

[1] J. J. Raven (Cambridge), in his *Essay on Isaiah* vii.–ix. 7, observes on chap. viii. 3: "Now to accomplish the sign that was given to Ahaz,

law of the history of Israel was formulated to the prophet on the occasion of his call in chap. vi., there is now added another son, to whom the inscription on the tablet (with omission of the לְ) is given as a name, and who therefore symbolizes the approaching chastisement of Syria and of the kingdom of the ten tribes. Before this boy learns to lisp the name of father and mother, they will carry away (יִשָּׂא, not 3 *imperf. Ni.* which is יִנָּשֵׂא, but *Kal* with the latent undetermined subject הַנּוֹשֵׂא, Ges. § 137. 3) the treasures of Damascus and the trophies (*i.e.* spoils taken from the flying or slaughtered enemy) of Samaria before the king of Assyria, and he will therefore leave the territory of the two capitals as a conqueror. It is true that Tiglath-Pileser only conquered Damascus and not Samaria; but he wrested from Pekah, the king of Samaria, the land beyond the Jordan and also a part of the land on this side. The trophies which he took home from there to Assyria were not less שְׁלָלַל שֹׁמְרוֹן than if he, as Shalmanasar-Sargon afterwards did, had conquered Samaria. The birth of Mahershalal took place about three-quarters of a year later than the preparation of the tablet (for there is no need to take וָאֶקְרַב in the sense of a plupf.); and the interval defined from the birth of the boy till the chastisement of the allied kingdoms amounts to about one year. Now, as the Syro-Ephraimitish war did not begin later than in the first year of Ahaz, and as the chastisement by Tiglath-Pileser occurred during the lifetime of the allies, whereas Pekah was murdered soon thereafter (2 Kings xv. 30), there elapsed from the beginning of the war to the chastisement of the allies at most three years, and the setting forth of the tablet cannot consequently be assigned a much later date than the scene with Ahaz. The inscription on the tablet adopted as the name of the child was not a purely consolatory prophecy, since the prophet had shortly before prophesied that the same Assyria would devastate Judah as well as the two allied countries. It was only a practical proof of the omniscient omnipotence of Jehovah shaping the history of the future. The prophet has indeed the melancholy vocation of

the prophet takes to wife the young woman spoken of;" but this and other forced hypothetical explanations—such as that Ahaz may have adopted Mahershalal—convict themselves.

having to make obdurate, to harden. Hence his discoursing and acting are so enigmatical in relation to both the king and the people. Jehovah foreknows the consequences which the calling in of the help of Assyria will have for Syria and Israel. This knowledge He writes down with the certification of witnesses. If this is fulfilled, it is at the same time a termination to the rejoicing of the king and people in their self-obtained deliverance.

But Isaiah does not find himself surrounded merely by the very wide circle of an incorrigible people ripe for judgment. He does not stand alone, but is surrounded by a small band of believing disciples, who need consolation, and are worthy of it. It is to these that the promising other side of the prophecy of Immanuel belongs. Mahershalal cannot comfort or console them; for they know that when Assyria has done with Damascus and Samaria, the troubles of Judah are not over, but are only really about to begin. The prophecy of Immanuel is destined to be the stronghold of the believers in the terrible judgment time of the worldly power which was then commencing; and to turn into the light and unfold the consolation it contained for the believers, is the purpose of the discourses which now follow.

The Esoteric Discourses, Chaps. VIII. 5–XII.

A.—*Immanuel's consolation in the coming darknesses*, chap. viii. 5–ix. 6.

The heading and introduction: "*And Jehovah continued further to speak to me as follows*," extends to all the following discourses as far as chap. xii. They all tend to consolation. But consolation presupposes need of consolation. Hence the prophet must also begin here with threatening of judgment. Vers. 6, 7: "*Forasmuch as this people despises the waters of Siloa that go softly and hold with delight to Rezin and the son of Remaliah—therefore behold! the All-Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, the mighty and the great ones, the king of Assur and all his host; and it rises up over all his channels, and goes over all his banks.*" The Siloa has the name שִׁלֹחַ, or, according to a well-supported reading, שִׁלֹּחַ

(the resolved open form like קִיטֹר, צִינֹק is interchangeable with the sharpened form like מְלֹוא, צְנֹור, בְּיֹור, and the full writing with the defective as in שְׁחֹור, שִׁיחֹור), *ab emittendo,* either in an infinitive sense as shooting forth, or in a concretely coloured participal sense (after the form נְבֹוך) as *emissus* (*ἀπεσταλμένος*, John ix. 7), bubbling forth; cf. Talm. בית השלחין, land to be artificially irrigated (*oppos.* בית הבעל, fertilized by rain).[1] The "waters of Siloa" streamed from what is now called the Mary-spring, and they were brought from there to the western city by means of a canal sunk in the rocks; and they served besides for watering the gardens lying at the outlet of Tyropœon and the valley of Kedron (see Mühlau, Art. "Siloah" in Riehm's *Dict.*). The canal had a slight slope; the fall, therefore, was moderate; and, further, the spring was intermittent. These still-flowing waters[2] present an image of the invisible ruling of God which does not always appear sensibly to the eye,—that God whom Israel and the royal house with which He had connected His promise might call their own. The beautiful figure was the more appropriate, that the Siloa passage ran through the Ophel from the north-east to the south-west, and the Siloa water therefore to a certain extent streamed from Zion. But Zion and the mount of the temple are one, and hence Jerome has good ground for representing the *fons Siloe* as flowing *ad radices montis Sion,* and again *in radicibus montis Moria.* The reproach of

[1] Since Athias, the written form הַשִּׁלַּח (without Dagesh) has come in. But all the editions from Soncin and the Complutensian to the Venetian of 1521 (as well as Nissel, Lombroso, and Hutter) have הַשִּׁלֹּחַ. The Cod. Babyl. also writes it thus with Dagesh (although a later hand has erased it), and the Targum has שִׁלּוּחָא. It is true that Kimchi also erroneously quotes (under the form פִּיעֹול) שִׁילֹוחַ; but there is not a single text which presents this double *plena scriptio* with ל *raphatum.*

[2] Rabban Simon b. Gamaliel—as we read in *Erachin* 10*b*—taught that the Siloah poured forth water only to the extent of an *as,* that is, so that the opening of the spring had only the circumference of an *as.* Then the king ordered that it (the Siloah) was to be enlarged, that it might give more water. But, on the contrary, it gave less, so that they again made it smaller, and it then ran as before; in order thus to confirm what is said in Jer. ix. 13: "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might."

despising the waters of Siloah applies to Judah as well as to Ephraim, and not to the latter only (Nägelsbach): to the former, because it trusts in Assyria and despises the less tangible but surer help which the house of David—if it remained faithful—had to expect from the God of promise; to the latter, because it had allied itself with Aram to overthrow the house of David. And yet the house of David, although sunken and deformed, is the God-chosen fountain-head of the salvation which is realized in secret still course. The second reproach applies more especially to Ephraim. אֵת is a prep.: and (because) delighting (is felt) with (see on the form of connection before a following preposition, Ges. § 116. 1), *i.e.* in and by the fellowship with Rezin and Pekah, שׂוֹשׂ אֵת like רָצָה עִם. The substantive clause is preferred to the verbal clause וְיָשֹׂשׂ on account of the antithetical consonance of מְשׂוֹשׂ with מְאַס. Knobel and others refer the reproof to dissatisfied Jews who were secretly favourable to the undertaking of the two allies. But although there may have been such under the misgovernment of Ahaz (to which Luzzatto refers the הַלְאוֹת אֲנָשִׁים), yet chap. vii. 2 speaks of the people of Judah without exception, and הָעָם הַזֶּה, which in Isaiah mostly applies to Judah (*e.g.* chap. xxix. 13), but sometimes also to the whole people, with special reference to Ephraim (chap. ix. 15, cf. chap. ix. 7, 8), will consequently in attachment to chap. viii. 4 comprehend Ephraim. This is also confirmed by ver. 8; and chap. ix. 7 sqq. may be cited in support of it, where sin and punishment are also apportioned to Ephraim and Judah. An explanation which would allow the immediate reference of העם הזה to Judah would be welcome. Such an expedient is furnished by Köhler (*Gesch.* ii. 1, p. 2), who refers 6*a* to Judah and explains 6*b* thus: "And because nothing but jubilation prevails with Rezin and the son of Remaliah about the previous succeeding of their plans." But את after ומשׂוש makes the impression that it indicates the object of the delighting. Perhaps מָסוֹס is to be read with Meier and Bredenkamp, following which Reuss also translates: *et perd courage au sujet de Reṣîn;* מָסוֹס, melting away (chap. x. 18), for fear is perhaps pregnant for fearing, and is in virtue of a bold construction, *πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον* (like שִׁישׁ, chap. lxv. 18), connected with the

accusative of the object. This melting away would correspond to the trembling like aspen leaves in chap. vii. 2. But however the text is to be taken, what is threatened in vers. 7, 8 must be referred to Ephraim and Judah. The image of the invasion of Assyria is, as in Jer. xlvii. 2, taken from the periodic overflowings of the Euphrates. The overflow of the Assyrian host (כָּבוֹד here used of a heavy massive multitude) strikes Ephraim first, in whose territories it flows over everything. אָפִיק is the channel holding the water, and גְּדָיָה the bank; גְּדוֹת is abbreviated from גְּדָיוֹת. The threat of punishment is introduced by וְלָכֵן; וְ is like the Arab. ف, the mark of sequence (Ewald, § 348*b*). The words אֶת־מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר we take as an elucidation by the prophet himself, as in chap. vii. 17.

Not till then, but certainly then, and irresistibly, this overflowing reaches on to Judah. Ver. 8: "*And presses forward into Judah, overflows, and streams farther, till it reaches to the neck; and the spreadings out of its wings fill thy land, as broad as it is, O Immanuel!*" Ephraim is put wholly under water by the river; it perishes entirely. But in Judah the river rolling on (עָבַר, driving farther or thereover, Hab. i. 11) and pressing forwards (חָלַף), really reaches the most dangerous height; yet if a deliverer is found, there is still a possibility of being saved. Such a deliverer is Immanuel. To him the prophet complains that the land which is his land, and not merely the land of his birth (Gen. xii. 1; Jonah i. 8) but of his dominion (cf. chap. ix. 6), is almost swallowed up by the world-power; the land has become filled in its whole breadth (cf. on וְהָיָה, Ges. § 147*a*) by the outspreadings (מְטוֹת, a Hophal noun; cf. similar nominal forms in ver. 23, chap. xiv. 6, xxix. 3, and especially Ps. lxvi. 11[1]) of the wings of the stream, *i.e.* of the masses of water covering the land, pouring from the main stream like two equally broad wings, on either side of the trunk. The figure of wings of the stream is introduced by the fact that the stream represents the army of Assyria, and the wings of the stream are the אַנְפֵּי, the wings of the army of Assyria.

[1] נטה, to spread itself out, applied to a river, corresponds to the Arab. *maddu*, *yamuddu*, which is also said of the water passing over its bank and the surroundings, and flooding them.

But it also naturally occurs from the nature of the subject to compare the onward hurrying stream to a bird shooting thither; Ἀετός is an old name of the Nile.[1] Immanuel, whether it be written masoretically as one word or as two, is here in any case used as a proper name, as in chap. vii. 14 (as Jerome remarks, *nomen proprium non interpretatum*). Bredenkamp makes the apostrophe of Immanuel into an apostrophe of the people of Judah, and takes עִמָּנוּ אֵל as the watchword: *With us is God.* But we cannot let this Old Testament invocation of the name of the future Christ (Acts ix. 14; 1 Cor. i. 2) be so easily wrested from us.

The upturned look, imploring help, does not remain unanswered. The lamentation over the threatening destruction is immediately transformed into the jubilation of holy defiance. Vers. 9, 10: "*Exasperate yourselves, O peoples, and break to pieces; and learn it, all distances of the earth! Gird yourselves, and break to pieces; gird yourselves, and break to pieces! Counsel council, and it comes to naught; speak speech, and it does not become real: for with us is God.*" The second imperatives in ver. 9 are threatening words of authority, having a future signification, and alternating in ver. 10 with imperfects: Go on exasperating yourselves (רֹעוּ with the tone on the penult., and therefore not *Pu.* of רָעָה, *consociari*, as the Targum translates, but the *Qal* of רָעַע, *malum esse*), go on equipping yourselves; nevertheless ye are about to fall in pieces (חֹתּוּ from חָתַת, related to כָּהַת, *confringi, consternari*). The prophet classes together all the peoples that are rushing on against God's people, pronounces upon them the sentence of annihilation, and calls upon all the distant lands to hear this ultimate fate of the kingdom of the world spoken to them. The world-kingdom must be shattered to pieces in the land of Immanuel; for with us—as the watchword of believers runs in reference to Him—with us is God!

[1] A. v. G. in the *Lit. CBl.* 1869, Nr. 5, puts forward the conjecture that Αἴγυπτος, which is also used as an original name of the river, is equivalent to αἰγυπιός, because the powerful many-armed river made the impression on the first Hellenes of a bird of prey with powerful pinions. Ποταμός is hardly to be derived from πέτ-ομαι, but rather from πι—Π[Ε]Τ—ω, and is therefore synonymous with יַרְדֵּן (see A. Kolbe in the *Zeitschrift für d. Gymnasialwesen*, xx. 927).

There now follows in ver. 11 an explanatory proposition. It seems at first sight to turn away to a different theme, but it stands in the closest connection with the triumphal words of vers. 9, 10. Immanuel is the stronghold, the fortress of the believers in the approaching time of Assyrian judgment. He and in Him God, and not any kind of human support. This is the connection of vers. 11, 12: "*For Jehovah has thus spoken to me, overpowering me with God's hand, and pressing it upon me not to walk in the way of this people, saying: Call not conspiracy all that this people calls conspiracy, and what is feared by it fear not, and do not think terrible.*" הַיָּד, the hand, is the absolute hand which, when it is laid upon a man, overpowers all his perception, feeling, and thinking; חֲזָקַת הַיָּד (that is to say, עָלַי, Ezek. iii. 14) is therefore the condition in which God's hand shows itself peculiarly strong on the prophet, the state of a peculiarly pressing and impressive working of God. Luther, like the Syriac, erroneously interprets it: *as if he takes me by the hand;* חֲזָקַת is related to the *Kal*, *invalescere*, not to the *Hi. apprehendere*. This circumstantial statement, and not the main verb אָמַר, is what is carried on in וַיִּסְּרֵנִי; for the latter term is not 3 *p. prf. Pi.*, which would have to be וַיִּסְּרַנִי, as Ps. cxviii. 18 (הוֹרַדְתִּנִי, Josh. ii. 18, is the form of address to a woman, with *ê* instead of *î*), nor does it need to so be corrected; rather is this 3 *p. imperf. Kal* (without suffix יִסַּר, Hos. x. 10, whereas *impf. Pi.* וַיְיַסֵּר) closely connected with בחזקת היד, according to the analogy of the usual passing of the participial and infinitive expression into the finite form. With overwhelming influence and instructively warning against going in the way of this people, Jehovah spake to the prophet as follows. The warning runs to the effect that the prophet and those who stand on his side are not to call קֶשֶׁר what the mass of the people call קֶשֶׁר (cf. the cry of Athaliah, קשר קשר, 2 Chron. xxiii. 13). The combination of Rezin and Pekah does not appear to be meant, for that was, in fact, an actual conspiracy or league against the house and people of David. Still less can the warning mean that believers, when they see how the unbelieving Ahaz brings the people into misfortune, ought not to enter into conspiracy against the person of the king (Hofmann, Drechsler); they are not warned, in fact, against making קֶשֶׁר, but from joining in the

popular cry when the people say קֹשֶׁר. Roorda is therefore perhaps right when he explains it thus: *sermo hic est de conjuratione, quae dicebatur prophetae et discipulorum ejus.* The same thing happened to Isaiah as to Amos (Amos vii. 10) and Jeremiah; when the prophets were zealous against calling in foreign assistance, they were treated as being in the service of the enemy, and as having conspired for the overthrow of the kingdom. Those who were honest were not to share in this confusion of ideas. But this explanation of Roorda is seen to be impossible, by the fact that the warning is introduced as addressed to the prophet himself; and even if it is to be regarded as applying mainly to the disciples gathered around him, yet it cannot exclude himself. No solution of the enigma justifies the transformation of the קֹשֶׁר into קָדֶשׁ, as held by Secker, Grätz, and Cheyne; for that Isaiah with his disciples is warned against making the religion of the people theirs, is a thought quite foreign to the connection, nor is it so expressed that the warning could be understood according to ver. 19. We are therefore thrown back upon the explanation which has been commonly adopted since Jerome: *noli duorum regum timere conjurationem.* The prophet and his followers are not to call the enterprise of Rezin and Pekah conspiracy; and they are generally not to join with cowardly political newsmongers (Nägelsbach) in the worldly ways of judging and speaking of the people who look upon things apart from God, nor in the hue and cry (2 Kings xi. 4) of the rabble who deny the higher hand in all things (Knabenbauer); they are not to fear (מוֹרָאוֹ) what is to the people an object of fear (with subj. suffix, which is applied objectively in 1 Pet. iii. 14), nor are they to regard it as terrible, or feel it as terrible (תַּעֲרִיצוּ, as in chap. xxix. 23; Deut. i. 29, and in the Jewish Tefilla נַעֲרִיצְךָ, "we shudder before thee").

The object of its fear was a very different one. Vers. 13–15: "*Jehovah of hosts, Him sanctify; and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your terror; so will He become a sanctuary, but a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, a snare and trap to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them will stumble and will fall, and break to pieces, and be snared, and taken.*" With וְהָיָה commences

the logical apodosis to ver. 13. If ye actually confess Jehovah the Holy One as such a one (הַקָּדִישׁ, as in chap. xxix. 23, for which there is only once *Pi.* in Deut. xxxii. 51), and if it is He whom ye fear, and who fills you with terror, (מַעֲרִיצִין, used of the object of the terror as מוֹרָא of the object of the fear, and therefore it is that which terrifies in a causative sense), then He will become a מִקְדָּשׁ. מִקְדָּשׁ may indeed also denote the sanctified object or the object to be sanctified, as Knobel understands it here according to Num. xviii. 29 (cf. the plural in Lev. xxi. 23; Ezek. xxviii. 18, *res sanctae*); but keeping to the idea of the word, this gives an unmeaning apodosis. Usually מקדש means the sanctified place, the sanctuary, with which the idea of an asylum is easily associated, because the temple was also regarded among the Israelites as an asylum, and was also generally respected as such (1 Kings i. 50, ii. 28; 1 Mac. x. 43; cf. Ex. xxi. 14). This is the explanation given here by most expositors; and the punctuators also took it in this sense, seeing that they have divided the two halves of ver. 14, as antithetical, by *athnach;* and thus מקדש is to be understood really, and to be translated sanctuary (Driver), and not asylum or refuge, which would be too narrow. The temple is not only a place of shelter, but also of grace, of blessing, of peace. Whoever sanctifies the Lord of lords, him He encompasses like temple walls; He hides him in Himself while death and tribulation dwell without, and He comforts, feeds, and blesses him in his fellowship. והיה למקדש must thus be explained, as I still always think, according to such passages as chap. iv. 5, 6; Ps. xxvii. 5, xxxi. 21, and Prov. xviii. 10; for the sequence makes us expect the expression of what Jehovah will become for those who sanctify Him. Another view is held by Reuss, who understands מקדש to mean an unapproachable *ἄδυτον* (حرام) (see Baudissin, *Studien*, ii. 89), and similarly Bredenkamp, and v. Orelli: "Sanctuary, He showing Himself as the destroying one whom one does not profane unpunished;" Cheyne, "and He shall show Himself as holy." But this gives an idea that is not germane to the following series of synonyms, and a thought that is not to be expected in relation to ver. 13. One expects the statement that He will become

a sanctuary to those who sanctify Him, also on His side. The antithesis follows: to the two houses of Israel, on the contrary, *i.e.* to the mass of the people of the two kingdoms as a whole, which neither sanctifies nor fears Jehovah, He becomes a rock and snare.[1] The synonyms are intentionally accumulated (comp. xxviii. 13) in order to make the impression of a manifold but always inevitable fate of death. The first three verbs of ver. 15 refer to אֶבֶן (stone) and צוּר (rock), and the last two to פַּח (snare) and מוֹקֵשׁ (springe).[2] All those who do not give the honour to Jehovah are dashed to pieces by His ruling as on a stone, and they are caught in it as in a trap. Accordingly, בָּם might refer to אבן and צור (on them, as Gesenius, Hitzig, and Cheyne explain it); but why then not בו on Him? We take בם, with Ewald and Nägelsbach, partitively like בּוֹ in chap. x. 22.

The words that follow in ver. 16: "*Bind up the testimony, seal the doctrine among my disciples,*" is either a prayer of the prophet addressed to God (Drechsler and others), certainly not to Immanuel (Vitringa), or a command of God to the prophet. As the word of God to the prophet has preceded this, and as God is not expressly addressed, it is such an instruction as we find in Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, 9, Rev. xxii. 20, and elsewhere, addressed to the seers of things in the far future. The explanation of Rosenmüller, Knobel, and others, namely, by bringing in God-taught men (*adhibitis viris piis et sapientibus*), is grammatically impossible. As keeping safely requires a place, the immediate local significance of the בְּ has to be maintained. People tie together (צָרַר, imper. צוֹר, instead of צֹר, the more orthographic mode of writing it, not infin. absolute, which would be צָרֹר) what they wish not to get separated and to be lost; men seal (חָתַם) what is to be kept secret, and is only to be opened by one entitled to do it.

[1] As Jerome on this passage informs us, the "two houses" were referred by Jewish Christians (*Nazaraei qui ita Christum recipiunt ut observationes legis veteris non admittant*) to the schools of Shammai and Hillel.

[2] Malbim correctly remarks: "פח catches but does not injure; מוקש catches and injures [*e.g.* by breaking off the legs or by crushing the nose, Job xl. 24]; the former is the simple snare [like the simple snare or gin for catching fieldfares]; the latter is the springe [a rod bent like a bow, of a flexible nature, which easily springs back], and the snare which catches by means of the springe (Amos iii. 5)."

And so the testimony of the prophet which relates to the future, and his instruction designed to prepare for this future—that תְּעוּדָה and תּוֹרָה which the great mass in their obduracy do not understand, and spurn in their self-hardening—has to be deposited by him well secured and well preserved, as if by band and seal, in the hearts of those who with believing obedience receive the prophetic word (לִמּוּד, of the same form as עִוֵּד, ready to learn and learned, common to both halves of the collection of prophecy, chap. l. 4, liv. 13). For it would be all over with Israel unless a community of believers continued to exist; and it would be all over with this community if the word of God, which is the ground of their life, escaped from their heart. There is here already announced the great idea which the second part of the Book of Isaiah carries out in the grandest style. The command in ver. 16 stands unconnected without וְאַתָּה like the beginning of a new discourse, and in ver 17 the prophet continues to speak of himself without וְאָנִי; וְחִכִּיתִי is the perf. of sequence. Ver. 17: "*I wait then upon Jehovah who conceals His face from the house of Jacob, and I hope on Him.*" There is a lacuna perceptible between vers. 17 and 16, and the supposition that something has fallen out (Cheyne) suggests itself. חָכָה gets from the fundamental meaning of "making fast" the meaning of firmly directing, of straining the mind towards something future, just as קָוָה, נִוִּי, originally means to be strained, firm, strong, and קָוָה therefore signifies strained expectation, confident hope. With the *î* form וְחִכִּיתִי, the older *ê* form וְקִוֵּיתִי interchanges (Ges. § 75, 9). A time of judgment has now commenced which will last for a long time yet; but the word of God is the pledge of Israel's continuance in the midst of it, and of Israel's renewed glorification beyond it.

The prophet therefore hopes in the grace which has now hidden itself behind the wrath. The future is his home, and he also serves it with his whole house. Ver. 18: "*Behold, I and the children whom Jehovah has given me for signs and types in Israel from Jehovah of hosts, who dwelleth upon Mount Zion.*" He presents himself to the Lord with his children; he devotes himself with them to Him. His bodily children are meant, not his spiritual children (his disciples, as Jerome

Calvin, Vitringa, and Bredenkamp explain it). It is not the latter, for the obvious reason that it would then be expressed by הבנים, according to the analogy of בני הנביאים and בְּנִי, the "my son" of the Proverbs. They are indeed Jehovah's gift, and certainly given for a higher purpose than the common everyday happiness of the family. They serve as signs and types ministering to the purpose of the history of salvation. אוֹת is a preindication and token, *σημεῖον*, in word and deed, which (whether it is itself something miraculous or natural) points to the future and is a pledge of it. מוֹפֵת (after the form מוֹסֵר = מֹאסֵר and מְאוֹן, from אָפַת, or after the form מוֹעֵד, מוֹקֵשׁ from יָפַת = אָפַת, أَفَتَ = חָפַךְ, أَفَكَ) is a miraculous work, *τέρας*, which refers to a supernatural cause or type, *τύπος* (*prodigium* = *porridigium*), which points beyond itself to something future and concealed, literally turned round, that is, opposed to the common, paradoxical, striking, standing out; Arab. أَفَتَ, *res mira*, *δεινόν τι*. His children are signs and enigmatic images of the future, and that from Jehovah of hosts who dwells on Zion. In accordance with His counsel (to which the עִם in מֵעִם points), He has set up these signs and types, He who can realize the future which they represent as certainly as He is Jehovah of hosts, and who will realize it as certainly as He has chosen the hill of Zion for the place of His gracious presence on earth. Shear-jashub and Mahershalal are indeed figures of future wrath no less than of future grace, but the name of their father יְשַׁעְיָהוּ declares that the salvation of Jehovah is the ultimate end. Isaiah and his children are figures and emblems of the redemption which is making way for itself through judgment. The Epistle to the Hebrews in chap. ii. 13 puts the words of Isaiah into the mouth of Jesus, because the spirit of Jesus was in Isaiah,—the spirit of Jesus which in this holy family, bound together by bands of the shadow, pointed to the New Testament community, bound together by bands of the substance. Isaiah and his children, together with his wife, and the believing disciples gathered around this family, form upon the ground and soil of the present

massa perdita of Israel the stock of the community or church of the Messianic future.

To this *ecclesiola in ecclesia* is directed the admonition of the prophet in ver. 19: "*And when they shall say to you, Inquire ye of the necromancers and of the soothsayers who chirp and whisper—shall not a people inquire at their God? for the living at the dead!*" It is unnecessary to take 19*a* as an anacolouthon (as Cheyne does): 19*b* is the apodosis, as כֹּה תֹאמְרוּ לָהֶם easily completes itself. Those who are demanding are Jews of the existing stamp; for, from chaps. ii. 6, iii. 2, 3, we know that all kinds of heathen superstition had found their way into Jerusalem, and were practised there as a trade. Those to whom the prophet assigns the answer are his children and disciples. The circumstances of the time were critical. People were going to wizards to obtain information about the gloomy future. אוֹב (from אוּב, to be bellied or hollow, to sound indistinctly) means primarily the spirit of sorcery or witchcraft, then the possessor of such a spirit = בַּעַל אוֹב, and more especially the necromancer or conjurer of the dead. יִדְּעֹנִי means primarily the possessor of a spirit of soothsaying (*πύθων* or *πνεῦμα τοῦ πύθωνος*), Syr. *jâdûa* (after the intensive form פָּעוּל with unchangeable vowels), then also the soothsaying spirit itself (Lev. xx. 27; Deut. xviii. 11), which may have been called יִדְּעוֹן, just as *δαίμων* is, according to Plato, = *δαήμων*. These people, designated by the LXX. here and elsewhere as *ἐγγαστρόμυθοι*, *i.e.* ventriloquists (*οἱ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν*), imitated (as Isaiah ironically introduces into the summons itself) the chirp which was ascribed to the shades of Hades, whose voice as well as their whole being had become a mere phantom, according to Homer a *τρίζειν*, *Il.* xxiii. 101, *Od.* xxiv. 5–9; and, according to the Assyrian descent into hell of Istar, a bird-like existence (cf. the Arabic name for magicians, *zamâzimu*, whisperers; Aruch, מגוש, *s.v.*).[1] What an unnatural thing that Jehovah's people do

[1] The Mishna, *Sanhedrin* 65*a*, defines it thus: "בעל אוב is the Python (פיתום), *i.e.* soothsayer (=*πνεῦμα πύθωνος ἔχων*), who speaks from his armhole; ידעוני, he who speaks with his mouth." The בעל אוב, in so far as he deals with the bones of the dead, is called in the Talmud אוֹבָא טַמְיָא, *e.g.* the witch of Endor, *Shabbath* 125*b*. On the history of the etymological explanation of the word, see Böttcher's *De inferis*, § 205–217.

not go to ask their God, but such heathenish demoniacal deceivers and deceived ones! (דָּרַשׁ אֶל, to turn oneself to any one to inquire, chap. xi. 10, synonymous with שָׁאַל בְּ, 1 Sam. xxviii. 6). What blindness to consult the dead in the interest of the living! The word of the prophet is the echo of the divine prohibition in Lev. xix. 31. הַמֵּתִים here do not signify the idols, as in Ps. cvi. 28, but the dead, as is proved by Deut. xviii. 11; cf. 1 Sam. chap. xxviii.; and בְּעַד is to be taken neither here nor elsewhere as equivalent to the substitutive תַּחַת, "instead" (Knobel), but, as in Jer. xxi. 2, as "for" = for the benefit of, as "for" elsewhere is equivalent to "on account of," Prov. xx. 17. The nekyiomancy (necromancy, medieval *nigromatia*, whence black art), which makes the dead teachers of the living, is a gloomy deception.

In opposition to such a falling away to miserable superstition, the watchword of the prophet and those who stood with him is thus given in ver. 20: "*To the doctrine of God and to the testimony! Or shall they not thus speak who are without a dawn?*" The summons: To the instruction and to the testimony, that is to say, to those of Jehovah of which His prophet is the medium, ver. 17, is like a watchword formed in time of war, Judg. vii. 18. In this formation the following אִם־לֹא gives the presumption of a conditional sense: he who has not this word is to be regarded as Jehovah's enemy, and will suffer the fate of such a one. This is to all appearance the meaning of the apodosis אֲשֶׁר אֵין־לוֹ שָׁחַר. Luther has given the rendering correctly thus: If they will not say this, they will not have the morning dawn; or, as he previously translated it, keeping more closely to Jerome: they shall never overtake the morning light, really, they are those for whom no dawn rises. But if we take אם לא וגו' as a conditional protasis, then אשר, as opening the apodosis, is and remains hard in style whether it is taken relatively: thus they are a people to whom, etc. (cf. 2 Sam. ii. 4), or as an alternative for the affirmative and recitative כִּי, of which there is no certain example (cf. 1 Sam. xv. 20). On the other hand, אִם לֹא also signifies "truly" (Ps. cxxxi. 2), according to which Luzzatto and Cheyne and Driver explain it: truly they shall speak thus when (אשר, *quum*, as, *e.g.*, in Deut. xi. 6) no dawn shows itself to them:

but this watchword is not suited for the people which is too late in thinking of something better, and that assertative meaning is got by אִם לֹא only by means of the suppression of a principal clause (Ges. § 155. 2 f.), which would be insipid here. But it also means *annon, numne;* and this meaning suggests itself the more readily here since there is a preceding question with הֲלֹא (cf. chaps. x. 9, xl. 28); and accordingly we adopt the explanation given by Knobel and Reuss: Or, will those who are without a dawn not agree with this word, this people whose present and future is surrounded by night, and which can hope for no breaking of light which could benefit them, inasmuch as they do not turn themselves to God's teaching and God's testimony, of which His prophet is the bearer?[1]

There now follows the description of the people which is without a dawn, and the description proceeds in the singular, into which the plural of the interrogative clause has changed (the individuals being thrown together into one mass). Vers. 21, 22: "*And they will enter thereinto hard pressed and hungry; and it comes to pass when hunger comes upon it, it is roused to anger and curses by its king and by its God, and it turns itself upwards and looks down to the earth, and, behold, distress and darkness, the anguish of night around, and thrust out into darkness.*" Cheyne, agreeing with Siegfried, changes the order of these verses (arranging thus, vers. 20, 22, 21, 23). Diestel and Nägelsbach begin, without changing the order, by taking ver. 21 as the apodosis to ver. 20. According to the syntax this is possible, but it more naturally occurs to take it so that the description of those who are without a dawn is further carried on by וְעָבַר: those who are without a dawn, and who will enter into . . . The singulars attach themselves to לוֹ in ver. 19; בָּהּ refers in the neuter to the land, as עָרֶיהָ in Job vi. 20 to the place. The people roam about in the land—so far will it come in the approaching Assyrian oppressions—נִקְשֶׁה, pressed by hard misery, and רָעֵב, hungry, for all provisions are gone, and the fields and vineyards are laid waste. As often as it again becomes

[1] Strangely enough, vers. 19, 20 are regarded in *Lev. Rabba*, c. 15, as words of Beeri, the father of the prophet Hosea, incorporated in the Book of Isaiah.

sensible of hunger, it falls into rage (וְהִתְקַצַּף, with ו of the apodosis and pausal *a* with *Rebiah*), and curses by its king and by its God, *i.e.* by its idol. We must thus explain the passage according to 1 Sam. xvii. 43 and Zeph. i. 5, if we would keep by the authenticated usage of the language, which shows no קִלֵּל בְּ corresponding to the Latin *execrari in aliquem* (Gesenius, Cheyne, and others, following LXX. Symm. and Jer.); the object of the cursing is rather everywhere expressed in the accusative. The connection, king and God, refers to one and the same object, as in Ps. v. 3 and lxxxiv. 4 (otherwise than in 1 Chron. xxix. 20): they curse by the idol who is regarded by them as king and God;[1] they curse with, as they consider it, this most effective curse their unhappy condition, without recognising in it the just punishment of their apostasy, and humbling themselves penitently under the all-powerful hand of Jehovah. Consequently, all this reacting of their exasperation and of their rage avails nothing—whether they turn themselves upwards to see if the black sky is not unclouding itself, or look down to the earth, there meets them everywhere only distress and darkness, only, as כְּעוּף צוּקָה expresses in a sort of summary, a surrounding night of anguish (כְּעוּף, a connective form of כָּעוֹף from עוּף, עָפַף, *obtegere*, the veiling round, darkening). The judgment of God does not convert them, but only heightens their badness; just as in Rev. xvi. 11, 21, after the pouring out of the fifth and the seventh vials of wrath, men utter blasphemies and do not penitently cease from their works. After this statement of what the people sees when it turns up its eyes or casts them down, the participial closing clause of ver. 22 *fin.* tells how it sees itself: *in caliginem propulsum.* There is no need to supply a completing הוּא, but from the preceding הִנֵּה there is easily repeated הִנֵּנוּ or הֲנֵנוּ, *en ipsum*; אֲפֵלָה, *acc. loci*, stands with emphasis first, as in Jer. xxiii. 12, בָּאֲפֵלָה. What next follows would be directly connected if ואפלה מנדח could mean *at caligo dispellitur* (more exactly, *est aliquid quod dispellitur*). This is the view of Hitzig and of Chr. A. Crusius. But the verb נדח, the *part. Pual*, the shrill interruption of the

[1] Menahem b. Seruk in his Lexicon (written *c. 950*), under the word אבן, assumes the reading בְּמַלְכּוֹ.

gloomy night-image whose close is expected, is altogether opposed to this interpretation. And yet the reason-giving כִּי, which now follows, assumes the thought that it will not always continue thus; but as it remains unexpressed we must seek to get it by looking back to אֲשֶׁר אֵין לָהּ שָׁחַר.

The prophet gives the reason for the assumption involved in the words he has used, namely, that a renewed dawning of light is to be expected, although not for that present generation. Ver. 23: "*For it does not remain dark where there is now distress: at the first time he has brought into ignominy the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, and in the last he brings to honour the road by the sea, the other side of the Jordan, the circle of the heathen.*" Is כִּי לֹא to be understood as interrogative with Abravanel and Luzzatto? (cf. 2 Kings v. 26); for is it not surrounded with night . . .? Such a form of address expressed by לֹא with the accent of interrogation, is the style of Hosea, but not of Isaiah. Or is כִּי, by supplying the intermediate clause, "it will not so continue," to be translated by "but" or "nay, rather, *immo*," Ewald, § 330*b* (Cheyne, 1870, "*nay*," now, "*surely*")? This would be a harsh ellipsis. We have not to read between the lines what is grounded by כִּי; but the statement that the unbelieving people of Judah is passing into a night without a morning, is grounded on the fact that a morning is coming whose light, however, does not rise first over the land of Judah, but over other regions of the land. The transition is harsh, however explained. Reuss remarks: *Transition brusque* (chap. iv. 2, vi. 13) *à la prédiction d'un changement heureux.* מוּעָף and מוּצָק, because formed from עוּף and צוּק, cannot have arisen from מֻוְעָף and מֻוְצָק (as מוּצָקָה, a tube for pouring through, from מֻוְצָקָה), and are therefore to be regarded as Hophal nouns, like מֻכָּה in chap. viii. 8. They indicate that which (*ʼōz, zi*) is darkened, oppressed, and then also that (*ʼōzi*) it is darkened, oppressed, and therefore the fact or circumstance of darkening and oppression; and they thus pass into the meaning of abstract verbal terms, being darkened, being oppressed. The meaning is that there is not, *i.e.* there does not continue, a state of surrounding night on the land (לָהּ, like בָּהּ in ver. 21, to be referred to אֶרֶץ) which is now in a state of distress, and, moreover, those very regions which God formerly made to

experience deep humiliations, will be brought by Him in the future to honour (הֵקֵל=חֵקֵל, *opp.* הִכְבִּיד, as in chap. xxiii. 9). The height of the glorification will correspond to the depth of the ignominy. The noun עֵת, however it be construed, is used as masculine, although it is originally feminine, however it may be derived. It is not correct to translate with Knobel: as in the former time, etc., so that עֵת is *acc. temp.*, and כַּאֲשֶׁר=כְּ for כְּ is never used conjunctionally in this way (see on Ps. xxxviii. 15) and in chap. lxi. 11, Job vii. 2, the verbal clauses after כְּ are elliptical relative clauses. The rendering adopted by Rosenmüller and many others is also wrong: *sicut tempus prius vilem reddidit*, etc. Hence, too, the וְ of וְהָאַחֲרוֹן is not the *waw* of sequence used in place of כֵּן of comparison, Ewald, § 360*a*. Both כָּעֵת הָרִאשׁוֹן and האחרון are adverbial determinations of time. The prophet intentionally designates the time of ignominy with כְּ, because this is a period in which the same fate should occur again and again. And, on the other hand, he indicates the time of the glorification with *acc. temp.*, because it comes in at once in order to continue unchangingly. It is undoubtedly possible also that האחרון is regarded as the subject, but the antithesis thereby become incongruent. The region (אַרְצָה, *localis*, with the signification obliterated, as in Job xxxiv. 13, xxxvii. 12, cf. Ezek. xxi. 31) of Naphtali is the later Upper Galilee, and the region of Zebulon is the later Lower Galilee. In the antithetical parallel clause what is meant by the two regions is specialized: (1) דֶּרֶךְ הַיָּם is the tract of land on the western side of the יָם כִּנֶּרֶת (Rashi, יְהוּשָׁה שֶׁל טִבֶּרְיָא); (2) עֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן, the country east of the Jordan; (3) גְּלִיל הַגּוֹיִם, the northern border district of Palestine, only a part of the later so called *Γαλιλαία*. All these regions were exposed from the time of the judges, by their local position, to the disintegration of heathen influences, and to subjection by heathen enemies. The northern tribes on this side, along with those on the other side, suffered most in the almost incessant war of Israel with the Syrians and in the later war with the Assyrians; and the deportation of their inhabitants went on increasing under Phul-Tiglathpileser and Shalmanasar until it gradually came to utter depopulation (Caspari, *Beitr.* pp. 116–118). It is these very regions which will be remembered before all

others when that dawn of glory arises. How this has been fulfilled in the commencement of the Christian era, is stated in Matt. iv. 13 sqq. On the ground of this prophecy of Isaiah, and not, as Renan in chap. xiii. of his *Life of Jesus* says, of a "considerably erroneous exposition of it," the Messianic hope of the Jewish people was actually directed to Galilee.[1] The Nazarenes, indeed, according to Jerome on this passage, referred ver. 23*b* to the light of the gospel spread *in terminos gentium et viam universi maris* by the Pauline preaching. In the time of the crusades, the *via maris* was still the name of the way passing by the Mediterranean from Acco to Damascus; but it is impossible to take יַם here as referring to the Mediterranean, for it was the Philistines and Phenicians who inhabited the דרך הים in this sense. But the prophet intends to designate the regions belonging to the Israelitish people which have suffered ignominy and affliction above all others.

The prophecy now takes together the inhabitants of those rejected and degraded regions, while at the same time the range of vision is widened. Chap. ix. 1: "*The people who walk in darkness see a great light; they who dwell in a land of the shadow of death—a light shines forth over them.*" The horizon is enlarged, not, however, to the heathen, but to the whole of Israel. Salvation does not break forth till it has become entirely dark along the horizon of Israel, as in chap. v. 30, till the land of Jehovah, on account of the falling away of its inhabitants from Him, has become a land of the shadow of death. צַלְמָוֶת is modified[2] in the manner of a composite

[1] It is a Jewish tradition that the Messiah will appear in Galilee, and that the redemption will break forth from Tiberias; see *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1843, Col. 776; cf. Eisenmenger, ii. 747.

[2] The shadow, צֵל, Arab. *ẓill* (radically different from *ṭall* = טַל, dew), gets its name *ab obtegendo;* and, according to the idea attached to it as the opposite of heat or of light, it was used as a figure of what is beneficial, shading (chap. xvi. 3—ظِلّ المَوت in a poetical passage of the Jâḳût of the thick terebinth-shadow of a valley), or of what was dark and horrible (cf. Targ. טַלְיָנִי, a night-demon). The verb צָלַם, in the sense of the Arabic *ẓalima*, bears the same relation to צָלַל as בָּהַם to בָּהָה, עָרַם, to be naked, to עָרָה. Another verbal stem is the צָלַם, from which comes צֶלֶם.

word (צֵל=צַל as, *e.g.*, in בְּצַלְאֵל), like the proper name עַזְמָוֶת in 2 Sam. xxiii. 31, being modified from צַלְמָוֶת according to the form קַדְרוּת (from צלם, Aeth. *ṣalĕma*, Arab. *ẓalima*, to be dark). The apostate mass of the people is to be regarded as swept away; for if death has cast his shadows over the land, it must be quite desolate. In this state of things those remaining in the land behold a great light which breaks through the sky hitherto covered with blackness. The people which turns its eyes upwards in vain, because with cursing, chap. viii. 21, is no more; it is the remnant of Israel which sees this light of spiritual and material redemption rise above their heads.

The prophet, in what follows, tells what this light consists in, first describing the blessings and then the star of the new time. He tells it in a thanksgiving of prayer and praise. Ver. 2: "*Thou makest the nation numerous, preparest for it great joy; they rejoice before thee like the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide spoil.*" הַגּוֹי is doubtless the Israel that has melted down to a small remnant. That God makes this again into a numerous people, is a leading feature in the picture of the time of glory (chap. xxvi. 15, lxvi. 8; Zech. xiv. 10, 11), which in this respect is a counterpart of that of Solomon in 1 Kings iv. 20. If our explanation is so far correct, then the *Chethîb* לֹא, taken negatively, can only be understood if we translate, with Hengstenberg, Hitzig, and Schegg, thus: Thou increasest the nation to which Thou formerly didst not give great joy, which must signify *per litoten*, which Thou hast sunk into deep sorrow. But it is unnatural to take one of the prophetic preterites commencing with הִכְבִּיד in chap. viii. 23 in any other than a future sense. We must therefore give the preference to the *Kerî* לוֹ,[1] and translate: *magnum facis numerum gentis, ei ingens gaudium paras.* לוֹ stands first without special emphasis, as in chap. xlv. 24; Lev. vii. 7–9; 1 Sam. ii. 3, *Kerî;* Job xxix. 21; Ps. vii. 14, cxxxix. 17; Dreschler gives it such emphasis, rendering thus: To *it*, in which there was not any appearance at all of such an issue. And it is intentionally that הִגְדַּלְתָּ and הִרְבִּיתָ stand beside each

[1] On the passages in which לֹא *Chethîb* is לוֹ *Kerî*, see commentary on Ps. c. 3, and in Job xiii. 15. הַגִּילָה is an ingenious conjecture by Selwyn and others for הגוי לא (הרבית).

other, in order to co-ordinate the intensity of joy with the extensiveness of the multitude. This joy is a holy joy, as לְפָנֶיךָ indicates; the expression is the one used in Deuteronomy for the joy that is experienced at the meals connected with the sacrifices and tithes (chap. xii. 7, xvi. 11, xiv. 23, 26). It is a joy כְּיֶשְׂמְחַת בַּקָּצִיר, like the joy in the harvest-time (the temporal בקציר operates here as a virtual genitive), just as men exult when they divide spoils. It is therefore joy over good things that have been obtained, and, moreover, in consequence of evil that has departed. For the division of spoil is a thing that is done by conquerors. This second figure is not merely a figure. The people so gladdened is actually a victorious and triumphant people. Ver. 3: "*For the yoke of its burden, and the stick of its neck, the stick of its driver, thou hast broken to pieces, as in the day of Midian.*" The suffixes refer to הָעָם. Instead of סֻבְלוֹ from סֹבֶל, the more vigorous form סִבְלוֹ is intentionally used with *Dag. dirimens* and *Chateph-Kamez*, under the influence of the previous *u*. The rhythm of the one-membered verse is anapaestic. סִבְלוֹ and נֹגֵשׂ בּוֹ both recall the Egyptian bondage (Ex. ii. 11, v. 6). The future deliverance which the prophet celebrates is the counterpart of the Egyptian deliverance. But as at that time the whole of the great people of Israel was redeemed, whereas only a remnant participates in the final redemption, he compares it to the day of Midian, when Gideon broke the seven years' dominion of Midian, not with a great army, but with a handful of undismayed warriors strong in God (Judg. vii.). One asks here: Who is the hero, Gideon's antitype, through whom this is to happen? The prophet does not say this yet, but building a clause with כִּי upon the others, he first of all gives a reason in ver. 4 for the ceasing of the despotic sway of the world-power from the annihilation of all the equipments of war. Ver. 4: "*For every boot of booted tramplers in the tumult of battle, and cloak rolled in blood—all is for burning, a food of fire.*" The complex subject stands first in the way of a protasis, for the predicate begins in the way of an apodosis with וְהָיְתָה; cf. chap. xliv. 12; Ex. xxx. 33, 38 (Driver, § 123*a*). All the equipments of war are meant, wherever they may be found; but while in Zech. ix. 10 the representation referring to the fratricidal wars between the separated kingdoms applies primarily

to the whole of Israel, here it is applied by reference to the previous subjugation by the universal power primarily to the foreign enemies from whom the possibility of conquering Israel henceforth shall be withdrawn. What becomes לִשְׂרֵפָה מְאֻכֶּלֶת אֵשׁ is not merely kindled and burned out, but entirely burned away; it is consumed by the fire until it disappears without leaving a trace behind. This closing statement requires for סְאוֹן the concrete sense of a thing that can be burned; and this at once excludes the meaning, noise or din (=שְׁאוֹן, Jer. Syr. Rashi, Malbim, and others). On the other hand, the meaning, equipment of arms, given by Knobel and others, is admissible; it is obtained by comparison of the derivatives of the Aramean זִין, אֲזַן and the Arabic *zâna*, Impf. *yazîn* (to deck, to equip); nevertheless the interchange of ס and ז in this word cannot be philologically established by the dialects. Jos. Kimchi has rightly referred to the Targumic סִיָּן (Syr., also *sâûn*), which means shoe (see Bynaeus, *De calceo Hebracorum*, p. 83), which is rather an Aramean than a Hebrew word, and the application of which in this place is explained from the fact that the prophet has in his mind the annihilation of the Assyrian forces. One would, indeed, rather expect סָאוֹן (*sāûn*), *σανδαλούμενος*, instead of כֹּאֵן; but the denominative verb סָאַן may mean the appearing or coming up in the soldier's shoe or soldier's boot, *caligatum venire*, although the primary meaning is undoubtedly *calceare se* (Eph. vi. 15; Syr.). Accordingly we translate it: Every boot of the booted strider in the tumult of battle. Thus we do not take רַעַשׁ (which Grätz, after the Targum, would transform into רֶשַׁע), with Drechsler, as indicating the noise of the warrior proudly tramping in his war-boots, nor do we take it, with Luzzatto and Nägelsbach, as applying to the war-boot itself, for which, notwithstanding the *clavi caligares* of Pliny, *H. N.* ix. 8, the word is too strong; but we take it as referring to the noise of battle (as in Jer. x. 22), amid which the warrior, booted for military service, appears. כֹּאֵן is genitive and מְגוֹלָלָה is attributive; rolled in דָּמִים, that is, in violently shed blood, in which the mortally wounded warrior rolled about. The prophet intentionally names boot and cloak. The destruction of the hostile weapons is viewed as a matter of course, when even every single shoe which a soldier of the enemy

has worn, and every soldier's cloak lying on the battle-field, is given up to the fire.

The prophet upon the two sentences with כִּי now rears a third. The ground of the triumph is the deliverance, and the ground of the deliverance is the annihilation of the enemy, and the ground of all the joy, of all the freedom, of all the peace, is the new great king. Ver. 5: "*For a child is born to us, a son is given to us, and the government rests upon His shoulder, and they call His name: Wonder, Counsellor, Strong God, Eternally Father, Peace Prince.*" He whom the prophet foretells in chap. vii. as the Son of the virgin, who was to grow up in a troublous time, is here beheld by him as born (but the words do not say that this is now seen only in the vision of the prophet), and as having entered upon possession of the government. In the former passage he appeared as a sign, and here as a gift of grace. The prophet does not say expressly here, any more than in chap. vii., that he is a descendant of David. But this follows of itself from the fact that he bears הַמִּשְׂרָה (from שָׂרָה=שָׂרַר, שׂוּר), the government with its official right, chap. xxii. 22, upon his shoulder; for the promise of eternal kingship, of which the new-born child is the fulfilment, has been bound up with the seed of David in the course of the history of Israel since 2 Sam. vii. In chap. vii. it is the mother who names the child; here it is the people, or any one who rejoices in him. וַיִּקְרָא, "they name, he is called," as Luther correctly translates, but under the mistaken idea that the Jews, in order to efface the Messianic sense of the passage, had altered the original וַיִּקְרָא into וַיִּקָּרֵא. The active ויקרא has, in fact, been misused by Jewish expositors with this object in view, as Rashi, Kimchi, Malbim, and others, following the example of the Targum, explain the passage thus: The God who is called, and is פלא יועץ אל־גבור אבי־עד, calls his name שר־שלום; but this explanation evidently tears asunder the connection in the clause from a motive or tendency. And Luzzatto rightly observes that one does not here expect attributes of God, but such as characterize the child; and therefore he translates thus: God, the Strong, the Eternally-Father the Peace-Prince, resolves upon something wonderful. He thus persuades himself that the whole of this long clause is meant to be the

proper name of the child, as, indeed, other proper names thus consist of whole verbal clauses, not merely in Arabic (as, for example, the giant's name, *baraḳa naḥruhu*, his collar-bone flashes), but also in the Hebrew, as, for instance, the names of the two sons of the prophet. But granting such a sesquipedalian proper name to be possible, how unskilfully would it be formed, since the long-winded sentence, which yet should have to be spoken in one breath, would resolve itself in this form into separate clauses which are again names, and, moreover, contrary to expectation, names of God! This holds also against Cheyne, who maintains that what follows שמו is one name, although not, as Luzzatto thinks, in the form of a connected proposition. There are, however, in any case five, or if, with Cheyne, Wonderful-Counsellor is taken together, four names, forming one name. According to Luzzatto's way of taking it, the name would also be one name as regards its form. Luzzatto frankly confesses what prompted him to his view. He formerly attempted, like Aben Ezra, to take the words from פלא to שר־שלום as the name of the child, regarding אל גבור as well as אבי־עד as a hyperbolical expression, like the words applied to the king in Ps. xlv. 7*a*; but afterwards he could not help taking the view that it was absolutely impossible for a human child to be called אל גבור, as God Himself is in chap. x. 21. The accentuators likewise appear to have shrunk from making אל גבור be regarded as a human name. For if ויקרא שמו was to be the introduction of the following string of names, then שְׁמוֹ would not have been marked with *geresh*, but with *zakeph*. It is inter-punctuated as if אבי־עד שר־שלום were the name of the child, and what precedes from פלא were the name of the God who assigns to him these two names of honour. But wherefore should there be just here in connection with the naming of the child such a periphrastic designation of God, seeing that this is not Isaiah's habit elsewhere, and generally it is unexampled, especially in this form, without a prefixed ה׳? Moreover, the names of God, in order to mark them off in contrast to the two names of the child, should at least be determined thus: הַיּוֹעֵץ פֶּלֶא הָאֵל הַגִּבּוֹר. Supposing then that, according to the accentuation, the translation would be: "And He who is a Wonder of a Counsellor, or (as in this case we

expect a connective accent instead of the *telîsha*, although the least separative accent) He who resolves upon something wonderful, the Strong-God, calls his name: Eternally-Father, Peace-Prince:" we must yet reject it as resting upon misunderstanding and misinterpretation. We take the whole from פלא—as the connection, expression, and syntax require —as a governed accusative predicate to the ויקרא שׁמו, which stands at the head: "they call his name" (cf. קרא, they name, it is called, Gen. xi. 9, xvi. 14; Josh. vii. 26, and *supra* chap. viii. 4, ישׂא, they will carry; chap. vii. 24, they will come, Ges. § 137. 3). If it be objected to the Messianic interpretation of chap. vii. 14, 15, that the Christ who appeared has not been called Immanuel, but Jesus, this objection is removed by the fact that neither did He bear as a proper name the five names by which He is to be called according to this second prophecy. Moreover, this objection does not less apply to the interpretations adopted by Jewish expositors, such as Rashi, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, Abravanel, Malbim, Luzzatto, and others, and also by such Christian expositors as Grotius, Gesenius, and Hendewerk, who are in favour of referring the prophecy to Hezekiah,—a view which is chronologically untenable, as has been shown in connection with chap. vii. 14. The name Jesus is a combination of all the Old Testament designations of the one to come, according to His nature and works. The designations given in chap. vii. 14 and chap. ix. 5 have not, however, disappeared in it; they continue to be in the mouth of all believers from Mary downwards; and there is none of these names under which worship and homage have not been paid to Him. The first name is פֶּלֶא or פֶּלֶא,[1] which is not to be taken along with יוֹעֵץ, as might seem recommended according to chap. xxviii. 29, הִפְלִיא עֵצָה. This is the view of the LXX., *A* S^2: *θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος*,[2] Theodoret: *θαυμαστῶς βουλεύων*. Explaining it

[1] To be written here with *zere*, according to Abulwalid, *Rikma*, p. 57, and Kimchi, *Michlol*, 202*a*. The codices vary (see Norzi).

[2] The *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος* of the LXX. is evolved out of פלא יועץ אל from the view that not only בני אלהים and בני אלים, but also אלהים in Ps. viii. 6, and אל in Job xx. 15, can mean "angels." In *A* and S^2 there is interpolated after *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος* a new independent translation of the five names: *θαυμαστὸς σύμβουλος ἰσχυρὸς ἐξουσιαστὴς ἀρχων εἰρήνης πατὴρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. S^2 has also *θεὸς* before *ἰσχυρός*, which again is

in this way, פלא יועץ may be regarded as an inverted form for יועץ פלא: One counselling wonderful things; and the possibility of this inversion is proved by chap. xxii. 2, תשאות מלאה, *i.e.* full of tumult. Or we may, with Ewald, § 287*g*, after the analogy of פרא אדם, Gen. xvi. 12, take the connection as genitive or appositional (Nägelsbach): a Wonder of a Counsellor; in which case the separating *telîsha gedola* in פלא would have to be exchanged for a connecting *mahpaeh*. Both combinations have their weak points, and their meaning would rather lead us to expect מַפְלִיא עֵצָה; whereas to take פלא and יועץ as two separated names has nothing opposed to it (not even the accentuation, which, in this combination of *pashta* with *telîsha gedola*, is without a parallel elsewhere, and is therefore unique). As the Angel of Jehovah answers Manoah in Judg. xiii. 18, when he asks how he is named, that his name is פִּלְאִי (פִּלְאִי), and therefore that his nature is incomprehensible by mortals, so the God-given Ruler is פֶּלֶא (√ פל, to split, separate) a phenomenon lying beyond human comprehension and natural occurrence. Not merely is this or that in him wonderful; he is himself entirely a wonder, *παραδοξασμός*, as Symmachus translates it. The second name is יוֹעֵץ, Counsellor, because in his royal office (Micah iv. 9), by virtue of the spirit of counsel which he possesses (chap. xi. 2), he always knows how to find and to bring counsel for the best good of his people; he does not need to surround himself with counsellors; but without being counselled he counsels those who are without counsel, and he is the end of all lack of counsel for his people. The third name, אֵל גִּבּוֹר, ascribes to him a certain divine nature. This indeed is not so if we translate the words with Luther: "power, hero;"[1] or with Meier: "hero of strength;" or as Hofmann formerly did: "a God of a hero;" or with Ewald: "hero-God," *i.e.* he who combats and conquers like an invincible God. But all these and similar renderings break

a double translation of אֵל. This interpolation of the LXX. is older than Irenaeus and Origen; see Field's *Hexapla*, *in loc.*

[1] Luther would have "power" understood in the sense of absolute might, but translated it more correctly in 1542 as *Deus fortis*. His accepted rendering is like the *ἰσχυρὸς δυνατός* of Aquila and Symmachus, and Theodotion's *ἰσχυρὸς δυνάστης*. Only Syr. and Jerome give אל its meaning "God;" and S^2 has, as stated, *θσ ισχυρος εξουσιαστης*.

down in connection with chap. x. 21, where he to whom the remnant of Israel again penitently turns is called אֵל גִּבּוֹר. Moreover, we cannot take אֵל (which in the sense of "mighty" only occurs in the plural, with the exception of Ezek. xxxi. 11, where the Orientals write אֵיל) in this name of the Messiah otherwise than in עִמָּנוּאֵל. And, in addition to this, אֵל in Isaiah is always a name of God, and he is strongly conscious of the contrast between אֵל and אָדָם, as is shown by chap. xxxi. 3 (cf. Hos. xi. 9). Finally, אֵל גִּבּוֹר is everywhere else a designation of God, as in Deut. x. 17; Jer. xxxii. 18; Neh. ix. 32; and the noun גִּבּוֹר is used in the designation adjectively, like אֵל שַׁדַּי in אֵל שַׁדַּי. The Messiah is therefore here called "Strong God" (and so the designation is understood by Knobel and others), but he is thus named as a hero equipped with divine power; or according to Kuenen, who compares Zech. xii. 8, as a mighty God surpassing the children of men, and not as a supernatural ruler. We compare יהוה צִדְקֵנוּ in Jer. xxiii. 6—a Messiah name which even the synagogue cannot call in question (see *Midrash Mishe* 57*a*, where it is cited as one of the eight names of the Messiah), and whose significance for the conscious faith of the Old Testament was that the Messiah would be the image of God as no other man (cf. אֵל, Ps. lxxxii. 1), and would have God dwelling in him (cf. Jer. xxxiii. 16). Who shall lead Israel to victory over the hostile world but God the Strong? The Messiah is the bodily presence of this Strong God; for He is with him, He is in him, He is in him with Israel. From the third name arises the fourth name: אֲבִי־עַד (according to *Ochla weochla* and some manuscripts אֲבִיעַד, in one word), Eternally-Father; for it is just what is divine that is eternal. He is thus named not merely as the possessor of eternity (Hengstenberg) in the same sort of way that the pre-Islamic Arabians called their time-god ابو عوض,[1] nor as creating a continued existence (Junilius, *Instituta regul.* i. 15: *Causa et genitor beatitudinis nostrae*), but as the tender, faithful, and wise trainer, guardian, and provider of his own in eternity (chap. xxii. 21). He is Eternally-Father as the eternal loving King, as Ps. lxxii. describes Him; the primitive word for king is Sanskr. *janaka*, begetter, *i.e.* father (see Max Müller's *Chips*, vol. ii.). He is

[1] See v. Orelli, *Zeit und Ewigkeit*, p. 107.

Strong God, as the man in whom God exhibits Himself, and he uses his divine strength in a philanthropic gentle manner for ever for the good of his people. And he is accordingly, as the fifth name says, שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם, a Prince who removes all peace-disturbing powers, and secures peace among the peoples, Zech. ix. 10, as it were the embodied peace which has come down to the world of the nations (Micah v. 4). If אבי־עד signified, according to Gen. xlix. 27, "father of booty" (as held by Hitzig, Knobel, Kuenen, Schultz, and others), then the advance to שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם would only express that he leads through a conflict rich in booty (Micah v. 3, 4; Isa. liii. 12) to peace; but אב has, when a ruler is in question, presumptively the same sense in its favour as in chap. xxii. 21, and in genitive connections עד always represents the adjective *aeternus* (*e.g.* chap. xlv. 17, lvii. 15).[1] He will therefore be thus named on account of the devoted protection and tender provision which he bestows upon his people, and which he indeed vouchsafes to them for ever. But the goal and the fruit of his dominion is peace. Intentionally the five names die away in שלום, like the three utterances of the Aaronic blessing. To elevate the Davidic government to a government of eternal peace is the end for which he is born, and for this end he proves himself to be what he is named and is.—Ver. 6: "*For increase of the government, and for peace without end upon David's throne and over his kingdom, to establish and support it through judgment and righteousness from now onwards for everlasting — the jealousy of Jehovah of hosts will accomplish this.*" לְמַרְבֵּה (with מ״ים סתומה)[2] is here not a participle but a substantive, according

[1] Among the names of persons compounded with אבי (see Nestle, *Eigennamen*, pp. 182–188), hardly one is found elsewhere in which the relation is genitival and the genitive has an attributive sense, for אבישלום, אבשלום means, in fact, not father-of peace, but the Father (God) is peace.

[2] In the Talmud the *Mem clausum* is represented as a mystery. When Bar-Kappara says (*Sanhedrin* 94*a*) that God designed to make Hezekiah the Messiah, and Sennacherib Gog and Magog, but that Hezekiah was not found worthy of this, and therefore the *Mem* of למרבה was closed נִסְתַּתֵּם, there is so far some sense in this, since the Messianic hopes really could cleave for a certain time to Hezekiah; whereas the assertion of a certain Hillel (*ib.* 98*b*), that Hezekiah was actually the Messiah of Israel, and no other was to be expected, is an absurd (perhaps antichristian) idea. Compare the beautiful Midrash on Neh. ii. 13, המ פרוצים, that

to the form מַרְאֶה מַעֲשֵׂה, and not from הַרְבָּה but from רָבָה, an infinitive noun expressing abstract action or its actual result. The august king's child brings an always more widely extending dominion and endless peace when he sits upon David's throne and rules over David's kingdom. He is a *semper Augustus, i.e.* one always increasing the kingdom, yet not by war, but by peaceful spiritual weapons. Internally he gives the kingdom מִשְׁפָּט and צְדָקָה, as the foundations and pillars of its continuing existence: legal right which he pronounces and ordains, and justice which he himself practises and transmits to the members of the kingdom. This new time of the Davidic monarchy is as yet still a thing of faith and of hope, but the jealous zeal of Jehovah guarantees its realization. The accentuation is here misleading, since it gives the appearance as though the words מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם belonged to the closing clause, whereas the perspective which they open applies directly to the government of the great descendant of David, and only indirectly to the work of the divine jealousy. קִנְאָה (properly glow, cf. Deut. iv. 24) is one of the deepest conceptions of the Old Testament.[1] It is double-sided; the glow of love has for its obverse the glow of wrath. For jealousy is jealous for the object of its love in opposition to everything which trenches upon it and this love. Jehovah loves His people. That He leaves it to such bad Davidic kings as Ahaz, and gives it up to the world-power, is not compatible with this love in the long run. His love flames up, consumes all that is adverse to it, and gives His people the true king, in whom that which was typified in David and Solomon culminates as in its antitype. With this same expression: the jealousy of Jehovah of hosts, etc., Isaiah seals the promise in chap. xxx. 32.

the broken walls of Jerusalem will be closed in the day of salvation, and that the government will then be opened, which has been closed up to the time of King Messiah (סתומה עד מלך המשיח).

[1] See my Introduction to Ferd. Weber's treatise on the Wrath of God, 1862, p. xxxv.

B.—*The punishing hand reaching out to inflict still more strokes.* chap. ix. 7–x. 4.

The great light will not arise before the darkness has reached its deepest. The gradual increase of this darkness is prophesied in this second section of the esoteric discourses. Many difficult questions rise in connection with this section: (1) Is it directed only against the northern kingdom, or against the whole of Israel? (2) What is the historical standpoint of the prophet in time? Most commentators answer that the prophet is here only prophesying against Ephraim, and particularly after Syria and Ephraim had been already chastised by Tiglathpileser. The former position is incorrect; the prophet indeed starts from Ephraim, but he does not stop with Ephraim. The fates of both kingdoms, causally connected as in reality they are, flow into one another here, as in chap. viii. 5 sqq. And it is not merely this or that point, but all that is expressed historically in this section which the prophet has lying behind him from the standpoint he occupies. We know from chap. ii. 9, v. 25, that he uses the *imperf. cons.* as the preterite of the ideal past. We translate here in the present throughout, for our mode of representation is familiar with making a past event present, but not with this historicizing of the future. In its external arrangement, no section of Isaiah is so symmetrical as this one. We have had approximations to strophes with the same beginning in chap. v., and with the same ending in chap. ii. In this section chap. v. 25*b* is made the recurring refrain of four symmetrical strophes. In translating we shall always take a whole strophe at once.

Strophe 1, vers. 7–11: "*The All-Lord sends out a word against Jacob, and it descends into Israel. And the people altogether must make expiation, Ephraim and the inhabitants of Samaria speaking in arrogance and pride of heart. 'Bricks have fallen, and we build up with hewn stones; sycamore trees are hewn down, and we put cedars in their place.' Jehovah raises high Rezin's oppressors over him, and goads on his enemies. Aram from east, and Philistines from west, they devour Israel with full mouth,—for all that His anger does not turn*

away, and His hand is stretched out still." The word דָּבָר is the messenger of the Lord in nature and history; it runs quickly through the earth (Ps. cxlvii. 15, 18); sent by the Lord, it comes to men to destroy or to heal (Ps. cvii. 20), and never returns to its sender with its object unaccomplished (chap. lv. 10, 11). Thus does the Lord even now send a word against Jacob (יַעֲקֹב, not used otherwise than in chap. ii. 5). And this heavenly messenger passes down into Israel (נָפַל, as in Dan. iv. 28, and like the Arab. *nazala*, the term used of the coming down of divine revelation), turning to lodge, as it were, in the soul of the prophet. Its first commission is directed against Ephraim, which is so little humbled by the misfortunes experienced under Jehu (2 Kings x. 32) and Joahaz (2 Kings xiii. 3), that they are presumptuous enough to substitute for bricks and sycomores (*ficus sycomorus*,[1] which furnishes an excellent wood for building, but is a very common tree, 1 Kings x. 27) hewn building stones (גָּזִית, Cod. Babyl. גָּזִית from גזז, like בְּרִית from ברר) and cedars. חֲתַלִּיף is not used here as in Job xiv. 7, where it means *nova germina emittere*, but as in chap. xl. 31, xli. 1, where it means, with כּחַ, *novas vires assumere*, so that in this passage, where the object is something external to the subject, it means *substituere*, like the Arab. *achlafa*, to restore, to replace. The poorest style of building in the country is contrasted with the best, for "the sycomore is a tree which only flourishes in the plain, and there the most wretched dwellings are still built in the present day of bricks dried in the sun, and of knotty beams of sycomore."[2] If the war has destroyed these, then more lasting and stately dwellings will be raised in their place. Ephraim is to be brought to feel this defiance of the judgments of God (יָדַע as in Hos. ix. 7; Ezek. xxv. 14). Jehovah gives to the adversaries of Rezin supremacy over Ephraim (שִׂגֵּב), and spurs on the enemies of Ephraim. סִכְסֵךְ, as in chap. xix. 2, from סָכַךְ, in the root meaning, which is dialectically guaranteed, means to prick, *figere* (which has nothing to do with the meaning to plait and to cover); from which

[1] As distinguished from *συκόμορος* or *συκάμινος*, the sycomore, תְּאֵנָה, means the mulberry-tree, *morus;* see Imm. Löw, *Aram. Pflanzennamen*, Nos. 332 and 338.

[2] Rosen, "Topographisches aus Jerusalem," in *DMZ.* 1860, xiv. 612.

we have שֵׁדָּה, סֵדָּה, שִׂכָּה, a prickle, a nail, peg, and the Aramaeo-Heb. שַׂכִּין, סַכִּין, a knife: and therefore the *pilpel* is to be translated to goad, to incite, according to which the Targum translates this passage and chap. xix. 2 and the LXX. chap. xix. 2. It is not necessary to adduce the Talmudic סְכְסֵךְ, to kindle (by friction), which never occurs in the metaphorical sense of to excite; our סכסך would be better taken as an intensive form of סָכַךְ, in the sense of the Arab. شكّ, "to provide oneself with weapons, to arm;" but this is properly a denominative from that *šikka* which means an offensive weapon, from stabbing and spearing, from which the transition is easy to the meaning of spurring on and instigating. The "oppressors of Rezin" (צָרֵי רְצִין, like הוֹי גּוֹי in chap. i. 4) are the Assyrians who were called in by Ahaz against Rezin. The indirect designation of them is peculiar, but neither does the striking out of the צרי (Lagarde) nor its transformation into שרי (Ewald, Cheyne) commend itself; most in its favour has the conj. צררו with רצין expunged (Bredenkamp), so that צררו (צריו) and איבו are specialized in ver. 11. The range of vision here widens to the whole of Israel; for the northern kingdom has never had to suffer from the Philistines, whereas an invasion of Philistines into Judah actually belonged to the punitive judgments of the time of Ahaz, 2 Chron. xxviii. 16–19. Ephraim is overrun by Aram, that is to say (if רצין is not expunged), by Aram as subjugated by Assur, and now tributary to it, and Judah is invaded by the Philistines, and becomes a fat prize of both. But this extreme distress is still far from being the end of God's punishments. Because Israel does not turn (לֹא שָׁב), God's wrath also does not turn (לֹא שָׁב).

Strophe 2, vers. 12–16: "*But the people turneth not unto Him that smiteth it, and they seek not Jehovah of hosts. Therefore Jehovah rooteth out of Israel head and tail, palm-branch and rush, in one day. Elders and the right honourable, this is the head; and prophets, teachers of lies, this is the tail: the leaders of this people have become mis-leaders, and their followers swallowed up ones. Therefore the All-Lord will not rejoice in their young men, and will not have compassion on their orphans and widows: for altogether they are impious and evil-*

doers, and every mouth speaketh blasphemy,—with all this His anger is not turned away, and His hand is stretched out still." The ו of והעם corresponds to the Latin *autem*. שׁוּב עַד is used of thorough conversion that does not stop half way. הַמַּכֵּהוּ, the smiter of it, or he who smiteth it, is Jehovah (compare, on the other hand, chap. x. 20, where Assur is meant). The article and suffix are used as in chap. xxiv. 2; Prov. xvi. 4, and elsewhere. It might be thought that the ו of המכהו was inadvertently appended from the following ואת; but the article could rather be dispensed with than the suffix; the case is similar to what we have in הַמַּעֲלֶם מַיִם, chap. lxiii. 11, *q.v.* There is now coming a great day of punishment, like several which Israel has experienced in the Assyrian oppressions and Judah in the Chaldean oppressions; and in it head and tail, or, according to another proverbial expression, palm branch and rush are rooted out. One might think that by this is meant the upper and the lower classes, high and low; but ver. 14 makes another application of the first double figure by giving it a turn different from its popular sense (cf. Arab. *er-ru'ûs w-al-ednâb* = high and low, in Dietrich, p. 209). Since Koppe this ver. 14 has been almost universally held to be a gloss (Hitzig, Ewald, Dietrich, Knobel, Cheyne, Diestel), and, moreover, a *sotte glose* (Reuss). But in opposition to this is to be put the habit of Isaiah (chap. i. 22, 23), and also of the other prophets and poets of interpreting their figures themselves (Hos. xiii. 15; Ps. xviii. 17, 18, cxliv. 7); against it also is the Isaianic conception in chap. iii. 3, xxx. 20; against, too, is the mediating relation of this verse to ver. 15; and against it further is the wit of the interpretation. The chiefs of the people are the head of the people as a body; and behind it sit the prophets, like the wagging tail of a dog, flattering the people,—prophets who love, as Persius says (iv. 15), *blando caudam jactare popello*. The prophet drops the figure of כִּפָּה, the palm branch forming the crown of the palm (which has its name from the fact that it is formed like the palm of the hand, *instar palmae manus*), and אַגְמוֹן, the rush which grows out of the marsh.[1] It signifies the rulers of the people

[1] The noun אֲגַם is used in the Old Testament as well as in the Talmud to signify both a marshy place (see *Mezîa* 36*b*, and more especially *Aboda zara* 38*a*, where גילוי אגמא signifies the laying bare of the marshy soil

and the rabble of the people. Accordingly, the demagogic prophets form the ignoblest extremity. For so far has it come, says ver. 15, that those who promise to lead by a straight way (אֹשֵׁר) lead astray, and they who allow themselves to be led by them are as good as already swallowed up by hell (cf. chap. v. 14, iii. 12). Therefore the All-Ruler will not rejoice over the young men of this people, *i.e.* He will let them be smitten by their enemies without going forth with them into the conflict, and he will deny his wonted compassion even to widows and orphans, for they are all utterly corrupt on all sides. The alienation, obliquity, and dishonesty of their heart is indicated by חָנֵף[1] (from חנף, which has in itself the indifferent root-idea of inclination, whence, in the Arabic, *hanîf* conversely signifies one who is decided for right); the badness of their conduct is indicated by מֵרַע, a sharpened form, as in Prov. xvii. 4, for מֵרֵע, *maleficus*,[2] and the vicious infatuation of their words is indicated by נְבָלָה. This they are and this they continue to be; and consequently the wrathful hand of God continues stretched out over them for the inflicting of new strokes.

Strophe 3, vers. 17–20: "*For the wickedness blazes up like fire: it consumes thorns and thistles, and kindles in the thickets of the wood; and they roll upwards in a high whirl of smoke. Through the wrath of Jehovah of hosts the land is charred, and the people has become like the food of fire: one does not spare his brother. They hew on the right, and are hungry; and devour on the left, and are not satisfied: they devour the flesh of their own arm: Manasseh, Ephraim; and Ephraim, Manasseh: these together over Judah,—with all this His anger is*

by the burning up of the reeds), and also the marsh grass (*Shabbath* 11*a*, "if all the אגמים were kalams, *i.e.* writing reeds, or pens;" and *Kiddûshin* 62*b*, where אגם signifies a stalk of marsh-grass or reed, a rush or bulrush, and is explained, with reference to Isa. lviii. 5, ליישנא דבוצלנא הוא, "it means a tender, weak stalk"). The noun אגמון, on the other hand, means only the stalk of the marsh-grass, or the marsh-grass, like the Aramaean חִישְׁתָּא, the marsh-growth, from خاس, to rot, to fust=אגם, أجم.

[1] On the extra-biblical use of the חנף, see *DMZ.* xxiii. 635, 636.

[2] The reading מֵרַע is wrong; the Masoretic reading is מֵרֵע, and the interpretation ἐκ πονηροῦ is therefore excluded.

not turned away, and His hand is stretched out still." The standpoint of the prophet is at the farthest end of the course of judgment, and from there he looks back; consequently this link of the chain is also past in his view, and hence the consecutive imperfects. The curse, which the apostasy of Israel carries within itself, now breaks fully out. Wickedness רִשְׁעָה, *i.e.* the constant willing of evil, is a fire which man kindles in himself. And when the grace of God, which stifles and checks this fire, is at an end, it breaks forth; the wickedness flames forth like fire (בָּעַר, as in chap. xxx. 27, is used of God's wrath). So it stands with the wickedness of Israel, which now consumes first thorns and thistles, *i.e.* the individual evil-doers who are the most ripe for judgment on whom the judgment begins, and then the thicket of the wood (כִּבְכִּי or סִבְכִּי, as in chap. x. 34, from סָבַךְ, Gen. xxii. 13 = סָבָךְ), that is to say, the mass of the people knit together by bands of iniquity, is set on fire (וַתִּצַּת, not reflexive Niphal, as in 2 Kings xxii. 13, to kindle, but *Qal:* to kindle into something = to kindle up, from יָצַת, related to יָצַת, literally to set on [fire]). The distinction which the two figures intend is therefore not the high and low (Ewald), not the useless and useful (Drechsler), but the individuals and the whole people (Vitringa). The fire into which the wickedness breaks out seizes individuals first, and then like a forest-conflagration it seizes the people in all its ranks and members who whirl up (roll forth) the ascending of smoke, *i.e.* they roll forth in high ascending smoke. הִתְאַבֵּךְ, *ἅπ.* λεγ., a synonym of הִתְהַפֵּךְ, Judg. vii. 13, to turn oneself or roll (cf. Assyr. *abâku,* to turn); the smoke itself has the name עָשָׁן, عَثَن, from the pillars of smoke curling into one another (cf. عُثْنُون, used of the felted beard of the camel). This fire of wickedness is nothing else but God's עֶבְרָה, for so wrath is called as breaking forth from within and spreading itself inwardly more and more, and then passing outwards into word and deed; it is God's own wrath; for all sin carries this within itself as its own punishment. By this fire of wrath the soil of the land is gradually and wholly burnt out, and the people of the land entirely consumed; עָתַם, *ἅπ.* λεγ., to glow (LXX. *συγκέ-*

καυται, and similarly also in Targum), and to be dark, black (Arab. *'atama*, late night), for what has burned out becomes black (cf. חוּם, Aram. שְׁחִים). Fire and darkness are correlates throughout the whole of Scripture. Thus far do the figures go in which the prophet unveils the inner nature of this stage of judgment. In its historical manifestation it consists in the most inhuman self-destruction during an anarchical civil war. Devoid of any gentler feeling (חָמַל אֶל for עַל, as in Jer. li. 3), they devour each other without being satisfied; גָּזַר, to cut, to hew into (whence the Arab. جزّار, the butcher), זְרֹעוֹ, according to Jer. xix. 9 = רֵעֵהוּ, a member of his family and tribe, who, as being a natural defence and support, is figuratively called his arm, Arabic *'aḍud* (see Ges. *Thes.* p. 433). The Talmud in reading זֶרְעוֹ testifies to the defective mode of writing זרעו (see Norzi). This interminable self-slaughtering and the king-murder conjoined with the jealousy of the tribes, shook the northern kingdom again to its destruction. And how easily the unbrotherliness of the northern tribes towards each other can turn into united hostility against Judah, has been sufficiently proved by the Syro-Ephraimitish war, whose consequences are always still going on, even now when the prophet is prophesying. This hostility of the brother kingdoms will still increase. But even this is not yet the end of the judgments of wrath.

Strophe 4, chap. x. 1–4: "*Woe unto them that ordain godless ordinances, and to the writers who prepare trouble; to force away the needy from demanding justice, and to rob the suffering of my people of their rightful claim, that widows may become their prey, and they plunder orphans. And what will ye do in the day of visitation, and in the storm that cometh from afar? To whom will ye flee for help, and where will ye deposit your glory? There is nothing left but to crouch down under captives, and they fall under the slain—with all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still.*" This last strophe is directed against the unjust authorities and judges. The woe upon them, as we have already several times seen, is the *ceterum censeo* of Isaiah. חָקַק (to cut in, originally to mark, chap. xxx. 8; Job xix. 23) is their deciding of decrees; and כָּתַב (Piel occurring only here, and

in the perf. according to Ges. § 126. 3) is their official subscribing and writing (not scribbling, scrawling, Ewald, § 120*b*). Their decrees are חֻקְקֵי אָוֶן (an open plural from a principal form חֹק=חֹק, as in Judg. v. 15, cf. גְּלֵלִי, הֲרֵרִי, עַמְמִי, צִלְלִי),[1] inasmuch as their content is nothingness, *i.e.* is the direct opposite of moral reality: and what they write out is עָמָל, trouble, *i.e.* unjust (cf. *πόνος*, *πονηρός*) oppression of the people.[2] Poor people who wish to enter upon legal proceedings are not allowed by them to do it; widows become their prey—that is, the object of their spoil, and they plunder the orphans entirely (compare on the diversion into the finite verb, chap. v. 24, viii. 11, xlix. 5, lviii. 5). For this the judgment of God cannot be escaped by them, and this is told them in ver. 3, the statement being clothed in three questions (beginning with וּמָה, *quid igitur*). The noun פְּקֻדָּה of the first question always means simply a visitation of punishment. שׁוֹאָה from שְׁאָה is empty and waste, emptiness and wasteness, then the rumbling of what has fallen down into an empty deep; and more generally it is a catastrophe, destruction, and here "coming from afar," because a distant people (Assur) is God's instrument of wrath. The second question runs thus: Upon whom will ye throw yourselves when seeking refuge (נוּס עַל, *constr. praegnans* only here)? Third question: Where, *i.e.* in whose hand, will ye deposit your wealth in money and property (כָּבוֹד, what is weighty in value and imposing in its appearance)? עָזַב with אֶל, as in Job xxxix. 11, or לְ, Job xxxix. 14, is to leave anything with a person as property in trust. No one receives from them their wealth as a deposit; it is irretrievably lost. To this negative answer there is attached the following בִּלְתִּי, which as a preposition after a preceding negation signifies *praeter*, as a conjunction *nisi* (בִּלְתִּי אִם, Judg. vii. 14), and when it governs the whole proposition, as in this case (cf. Gen. xliii. 3; Num.

[1] On the punctuation of חֻקְקֵי with vocal *Shebâ* (without *metheg*) see Kimchi, *Michlol*, 79*b*. In like manner Deut. xxxiii. 17 has רִבְבוֹת, not authenticated like רִבְבוֹת in Num. x. 36.

[2] The current accentuation, וּמֹכְתָבִים, *mercha*, עָמָל, *tiphchah*, is wrong. The correct accentuation is וּמֹכְתָבִים, *tiphchah* (and *metheg*), עָמָל, *mercha*; then עָמָל כָּתְבוּ is an attributive clause.

xi. 6 ; Dan. xi. 18), *nisi quod ;* and here, where the previous negation is to be supplied in thought, it signifies *nil reliquum est nisi quod.* The singular פֶּגֶר is used contemptuously, the high persons being taken together in the mass ; and תַּחַת does not mean *aeque ac* or *loco* (Ewald, § 217*k*), but *infra* in its primary local sense (cf. בְּתוֹךְ, Ezek. xxxii. 20). Some crouch down in order to find more room at the feet of the prisoners who are crammed closely together in the prison ; or if this is to be taken as referring to a scene of deportation, they sink under the feet of the other prisoners, being unable to bear their hardships. The others fall in war ; and as the carnage lasts long, in such a way that when corpses themselves they are covered by the corpses of the other slain (cf. chap. xiv. 19).[1] And even with this God's wrath is not yet satisfied. The prophet, however, does not follow out the terrible gradation further. The exile to which this fourth strophe points also actually forms the close of a period.

C.—*The annihilation of the imperial kingdom of the world and the rising of the kingdom of Jehovah in His Anointed,* chap. x. 5–xii.

The law of contrast which rules in the history of salvation also holds good in prophecy. When distress culminates, the course of events takes a turn and it is changed into help ; and when, as in the previous section, prophecy has become black as night, it suddenly becomes as bright as day, as in the section which now begins. The הוי spoken over Israel now becomes a הוי over Assyria (*Assur*).[2] Assyria, proud of its own power, after having served for a time as a rod of the wrath of Jehovah, itself now falls under the power of that wrath ; its attack upon Jerusalem becomes its overthrow, and

[1] Lagarde (*Symmicta*, i. 105 ; *Mittheilungen*, i. 210) reads בֵּלְתִי כֹרַעַת חַת אֹסִיר : "Beltis sinks down, Osiris is crushed" (according to xlvi. 1 ; Jer. l. 2). But the following יפלו ותחת הרוגים has then no connection ; and I still hold that it cannot be shown that Egyptian gods were worshipped in Judah in the time of the kings.

[2] [Dr. Delitzsch uses "Assur" rather than Assyria, and it is retained in the renderings of the Hebrew text.—Tr.]

on the ruins of this imperial kingdom of the world there rises up the kingdom of the great and righteous son of David, who rules in peace over his redeemed people and over the people who rejoice in him. This is the counterpart of the redemption from Egypt, and one rich in material for songs of praise, like that which happened on the other side of the Red Sea. The Messianic prophecy, which in chap. vii. turns the side of its curse towards unbelief, and the substance of whose promise breaks through the darkness in chap. viii. 5–ix. 6, like a great light, is standing now upon its third and highest stage. In chap. vii. it is like a star in the night; in chap. viii. 5–ix. 6 it is like the breaking in of the morning; and now the sky becomes entirely cloudless, and it appears like the noonday sun. The prophet has now penetrated to the fringe of the light of chap. vi. The name Shear-jashub, having emptied itself of the curse it contained, is now transfigured into a pure promise. And it now becomes as clear as day what the name "Immanuel" means, and what Immanuel's name אל גבור declares: the remnant of Israel turns itself to God the Strong, and God the Strong is henceforth with His people in the sprout of Jesse, who has the seven spirits of God dwelling in him. As regards the date of the composition of this third section of the esoteric discourses, most modern commentators agree in assigning it to the time of Hezekiah, because chap. x. 9–11 represents the conquest of Samaria as having already taken place. Now if the prophet had, in fact, already foretold in chap. vii. 8 and viii. 4, 7 that Samaria, and with Samaria the kingdom of Israel, would succumb to the Assyrians, he might presuppose it here as ideally a past. But vers. 9–11 really require us to assign the composition of this section, at least in its existing form, to the time of Hezekiah, and is opposed to the view that would assign its composition to the time of Ahaz, whether before or after the punishment inflicted on the two allies by Tiglath-pileser (Vitringa, Caspari, Drechsler).

The prophet begins with הוי, which is always used as an expression of indignant pain in opening a proclamation of judgment over the party named; although this proclamation, as in the present case (cf. chap. i. 4, 5–9), does not always

immediately follow, but there may be prefixed to it a statement of the sin by which the judgment is brought about. First of all, Assyria is more definitely indicated as the chosen instrument of divine judgment upon all Israel. Vers. 5, 6: "*Woe to Assur, the rod of mine anger and a staff is he in their hand—mine indignation. Against a reprobate nation will I despatch them, and against the people of my displeasure will I direct them to prey prey, and to spoil spoil, and to make it trodden down like street mire.*" What follows הוֹי is not necessarily vocative, but it may be the designation of the object (without לְ, אֶל, עַל), as shown by chap. i. 4. זַעְמִי is either permutative of the predicative הוּא, which is placed emphatically in front (cf. the אַתָּה־הוּא, similarly with *makkeph*, in Jer. xiv. 22), as we have translated it; or הוּא בְיָדָם stands elliptically for אֲשֶׁר הוּא בְיָדָם, the staff which they use is my indignation (Aben Ezra, Gesenius, Rosenmüller, and others), in which case, however, we should rather expect ומטה בידם הוא זעמי. It cannot, however, be rendered: "And a staff is he, in their hand is my indignation," as Knabenbauer gives it, for this breaks up the half verse too much. Nor is it permissible, following Knobel's view, to take זעמי as a separated genitive to מטה, and to punctuate מַטֵּה, which is altogether without an example in the Hebrew language.[1] Hitzig, Ewald, Diestel, and others eliminate הוא בידם as a gloss; but a glossator would have written אשר בידם, and what remains would be a tautology. Instead of וְלִשֹּׁמוֹ the *Kerî* gives וְלִשֹּׂמוֹ, as the infinitive combined with a suffix appears everywhere else; compare, on the other hand, 2 Sam. xiv. 7. Further, the manuscripts waver between מִרְמָס and מִרְמַס like מִבְטָח (Ewald, § 160*c*). Assyria is to be a means of inflicting the divine wrath on Israel; for Israel, and particularly (in accordance with the standpoint of this prophetical discourse) Judah, is the reprobate nation, the people which had become the object of the overflowing divine wrath.

The instrument of punishment, however, exalts itself and

[1] In Arabic this separation of the governed word from the governing word with a genitive relation (even apart from the allowable interposition of a word expressive of an oath) is a poetical licence; see de Sacy, *Gramm.* t. ii. § 270.

makes itself out of a mean into an end in itself. Ver. 7: "*Nevertheless he meaneth not thus, nor doth his heart think thus: for to destroy is his striving, and to cut off nations not a few.*" Assyria thinks לֹא־כֵן, not as he ought to think, in consequence of the fact that he is conditioned in his power over Israel by Jehovah. For what filled his heart (בִּלְבָבוֹ instead of the usual עִם־לְבָבוֹ) is the striving peculiar to the imperial power, not tolerating any independent people beside itself, to destroy peoples not a few (לֹא מְעָט in apposition, as in Neh. ii. 12, cf. Num. ix. 20), *i.e.* as many peoples as possible, in order to extend the range of its dominion, and to deal with Judah as with all the rest; for Jehovah is to Assyria only as one of the idols of the peoples. Vers. 8–11: "*For he saith, Are not my generals all kings? Is not Calno as Carchemish, or Hamath as Arpad, or Samaria as Damascus? As my hand has reached the kingdoms of the idols—and their graven images were more than those of Jerusalem and Samaria—shall I not, as I have done to Samaria and her idols, likewise do to Jerusalem and her idols?*" The king of Assyria bore the title of the great king (chap. xxxvi. 4); in Assyrian *šarru rabbu*, or even (cf. Ezek. xxvi. 7) of the King of kings; in Assyrian, *šar šarrâni* (*šarru*, not *malik*, because the former, in the political linguistic usage of the Assyrian,[1] is a higher title than the latter). The generals in his army he can call kings, because the satraps[2] who led their contingents were like kings in the extent and splendour of their dominion, and some of them were also really subjugated kings (cf. 2 Kings xxv. 28). He proudly asks whether one of the cities named was not as incapable of resistance as the other, and yet had fallen before him. כַּרְכְּמִישׁ (even after a connecting accusative, not כְּכַרְכְּמִישׁ, but כְּכַרְכְּמִישׁ,[3] on account of the incompatibility of

[1] In the titular designations of the gods, *šarru* (*šarratu*) and *malik* (*malkatu*) interchange, as Schrader has shown against Stade.

[2] Σατράπης (cf. σατρα in the Persian sense in the Acharnanians of Aristophanes), in Theopompus ἐξαράπης, in inscriptions ἐξαιθραπεύων, is the old Persian (cuniform) *khshatra pâvan*, *i.e.* government-keeper (*pâvan*, in neo-Persian abridged as بان in شهربان, *šarbân*, city-keeper, باغبان, *bâghbân*, garden-keeper), plur. Hebraized into אֲחַשְׁדַּרְפְּנִים.

[3] Cf. on the rule, *Luth. Zeitschrift*, xxiv. (1863) p. 414. The punctuation adopted is כְּכַ, כְּבַ, even after אה״וי; whether בְּמַ may also be adopted

the aspirates) is not Circesium nor Mabug, but the ruined site Girbâs (plur. Gerâbis), lying to the north-east of Aleppo, a name corrupted from *Εὐρωπός* (*Ὥρωπός*), or the right bank of the Euphrates, right over against the town of *Biredgik* (Assyr. *Garkamiš*), lying on the left bank. בַּלְנוֹ is usually regarded as the later Ctesiphon, on the left bank of the Tigris.[1] (Was it the same as בִּלְהָה, Gen. x. 10, and בִּלְהָה, Amos vi. 2?) As to Arpad, which is now an uninhabited heap of ruins named *Tel Erfâd*, in the Pashalic of 'Azâz, about three German miles north from Haleb, see *DMZ.* xxv. 258, 259, 655. Hamâth = Epiphania, on the river Orontes (which is now called العاصي, *el-'Aṣî*), is still a large and rich place. The king of Assyria had also conquered Samaria at the time when the prophet introduces him speaking. Samaria received its death-blow in 722 through Salmanassar, who died during the siege, and through Sargon, who succeeded in his place after the kingdom had been shorn of a great part of its territory in 734 by Tiglath-pileser. Damascus had been taken and plundered in 732 by Tiglath-pileser; and Carchemis, and with it the kingdom of the Hittites, whose capital it was, was subdued by Sargon in 717.[2] Neither, then, will Jerusalem hold out against him. As he had got idolatrous kingdoms into his power (לְ מָצָא, to attain, as in Ps. xxi. 9, and הָאֱלִיל with the generic article), which had stronger idols than Jerusalem and Samaria, he will likewise overcome Jerusalem like Samaria, Jerusalem having equally powerless idols. מִן, *prae*, implies only a "more than" (as *e.g.* in Ezek. v. 6), which may be either a more in number, or, what is more directly suggested, a more in power (compare the similar question in Amos vi. 2). Note here that ver. 11 is the apodosis to ver. 10, and that the comparative clause of ver. 10 is repeated in ver. 11 in order to bring Samaria and Jerusalem specially into comparison. The king of Assyria calls the gods of the peoples by the name of idols without the prophet transferring to him his Israelitish standpoint. On the contrary, the chief sin of the Assyrian lies in this. For

(cf. Ps. xxvi. 12, cvi. 7, cxxix. 2, ed. Baer) is questionable; see Strack, *Proleg.* p. 116, *Liber Psalmorum Hebr. atque Lat.* p. ix.

[1] See on this *Chald. Genesis*, p. 293. *Paradies*, p. 225.

[2] See Schrader, *KAT.* 2 Auf. p. 385.

while he recognises no other gods than his own national gods, he places Jehovah along with the idols of the heathen cults which had been introduced into Samaria and Jerusalem. For the worshippers of Jehovah this fact brings the consolation that such blasphemy of the one living God cannot remain unavenged. For the idolaters, however, it brings a bitter teaching; for their gods really deserve nothing better than to be spoken of with scorn. The prophet has now characterized Assyria's sin. It is ambitious self-exaltation above Jehovah, carried even to blasphemy; and yet he is only Jehovah's rod, which it was in His power to use.

And when He has used this rod so far as He would, He throws it away. Ver. 12: "*And it will come to pass, when the All-Lord shall bring to an end all His work upon Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, I will come to punish on the fruit of the pride of heart of the king of Assur, and on the haughty glancing of his eyes.*" The statement about the Lord suddenly changes into a direct utterance of the Lord. When He will consummate His whole work, a work which, as in chap. xxviii. 21, is punitive (Cheyne, Orelli, and Bredenkamp), this will be done in Zion and Jerusalem, where He calls to Assyria "thus far and no farther," with the judgment on Assyria, the instrument of punishment which has become presumptuous and further unusable. בָּצַע, *absindere* = *absolvere*, Lam. ii. 17, Zech. iv. 9, is a metaphor derived from the loom, as in chap. xxxviii. 12. There is no reason for taking יִבְצַע as *fut. exactum*, which would be expressed in the perfect in accordance with chap. iv. 4. The "whole work" is that which has been carried out to the utmost. The end of the work of punishment passes into the judgment upon the instrument of punishment, and therefore into the deliverance of Jerusalem from extreme distress. The פְּרִי of the pride of the heart of Assyria is his vainglorious blaspheming of Jehovah, in which his whole disposition is concentrated, as the internal quality of the tree is in the fruit which hangs aloft amid the branches. תִּפְאֶרֶת, as in Zech. xii. 7, is the self-glorification which expresses itself in the lofty look of his eyes (Prov. xxi. 4). A considerable number of genitives are intentionally brought together in order to express that Assyria is greatly puffed up, even to bursting. But Jehovah, towards whom humility is the soul

of all virtue, will visit and punish this pride. When He has punished so far that by further punishing He would annihilate Israel, which is inconsistent with His grace and truth, He then turns His punishing against the instrument of punishment, which falls under the curse of all that is selfishly opposed to God. Vers. 13, 14: "*For he has said: By the strength of my own hand I have accomplished it, and by my own wisdom, for I am prudent, and removed the boundaries of the peoples, and I plundered their stores, and, as superior, put down enthroned ones, and my hand took out the possessions of the peoples like a nest; and as men gather forsaken eggs, I have gathered up the whole earth,—there was no one who stirred a wing and opened the mouth and chirped.*" The imperfects ruled by the preterites express what happened several times. The second of these preterites, שׁוֹסֵיתִי (= שׁוֹסֵיתִי), is the only example of a *perf. Poel* of verbs ל״ה, and is only in appearance a mixed form from שׁוֹסֵם (Po. of שָׁסַם) and שִׁסָּה (Pi. of שָׁסָה). The object to this is עֲתִידוֹת (*Chethîb*) or עֲתוּדוֹת (*Keri*), which means *parata* in the sense of *τὰ μέλλοντα* (Deut. xxxii. 35), or, as here, *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*. According to the *Keri*, it is further to be translated: and put down, a mighty one, enthroned ones; כַּבִּיר, as in Job xxxiv. 17, 24, and xxxvi. 5. The Mishna (*Yadayim* iv. 4) has עתידותיהם (*Chethîb*), שׁוסיתי, and כביר (*Keri*). But the *Chethîb* כְּאַבִּיר is suitable if the כ is taken, as in chap. xiii. 6, as כ *veritatis:* as a strong one (superior in strength), not: as a bull (Bredenkamp); for אַבִּיר can be shown to have this meaning only in the plural (Ps. lxviii. 31, xxii. 13, l. 13), although it would give a relevant sense. It is possible, however, that what is indicated by אביר, according to Ps. lxxviii. 25, is a superhuman power (Cheyne), as the bull-god (*alpu*, and also *κατ' ἐξ. šêdu*) appears in the inscriptions as a power marching through the enemy's lands and trampling everything down. In ver. 14 the stiffer ו *consec.* appears before the 3rd pers. fem. The kingdoms of the peoples are here compared to birds' nests, which the Assyrian seizes upon and harries (אָסַף, as in Hab. ii. 5; cf. שׁפח in chap. v. 7); and their possessions are compared to lonesome eggs, the mother bird being away. And thus there is not even an appearance of resistance, and in the nest not one of the little birds stirs a wing to defend itself,

nor does any one open its beak to scare away by its chirping. Seb. Schmid correctly renders it thus: *nulla alam movet ad defendendum aut os aperit ad terrendum.* Thus proudly does Assyria look back upon his course of victory, and thus contemptuously does he look down upon the subdued kingdoms.

This self-exaltation is a senseless sin. Ver. 15: "*Dare the axe boast itself against him who hews with it, or the saw magnify itself against him who draws it? As if a staff were swinging those who lift it up, as if a stick were to lift up not-wood.*" What madness lies in this self-deification is indicated by the two questions. The boasting of the Assyrian is the bragging of an axe against (literally, over) him who hews with it (הַחֹצֵב בּוֹ, without moving back the tone, which is not usual, especially in participles of *Kal*, excepting ל״ה and ל״א), or of a saw (כַּמְשׂוֹר from נָשַׂר, נשׂר, Aramean נְסַר, in Mishna נָסַר, *serr-are*) against him who wields it (הֲנִיף, to move rhythmically, *i.e.* to and fro according to a determinate measure and time). Then follow two exclamations of astonishment at the absurdity of such a conceit of greatness; כְּ represents here a whole clause, as in the Arabic كَأَنَّ: it is the same as that, . . . it is as if. לֹא־עֵץ is one word, as in chap. xxxi. 8.[1] The stick is wood, and nothing more, a thing that is motionless in itself; the man is not-wood, an incomparably higher living being. In order to lift up wood there must be not-wood; and in like manner, where a man accomplishes something extraordinary there is always a superhuman cause behind, namely, God, who stands in the same relation to the man as the man to the wood. The plural מְרִימָיו points to the fact that by him who lifts up the stick there is symbolized Jehovah, the Cause of all causes, the Power of all powers.[2]

Next follows the punishment provoked by such self-deifica-

[1] Cf. لَا نَطْقِي as not-speech. There is used even the expression *el-lailáhîya*, the not-deity; the ي is to be regarded as *pars vocabuli*.

[2] The reading accepted by Baer, ואת־מרימיו, notwithstanding the imposing evidence in its favour, is certainly not the original one; it can be explained only in a way by taking ו as explicative: as if a staff were to swing, and indeed (were to swing) those who raise it; see my treatise, *Complutensische Varianten zum alttest. Texte*, 1878.

tion (cf. Hab. i. 11). Ver. 16: "*Therefore will the Lord, the All-Lord of hosts, send forth consumption against his fat men, and there burns under Assur's glory a brand like a fire-brand.*" There are three designations of God used here according to His unlimited, all-ruling omnipotence: הָאָדוֹן, which in Isaiah is always used in connection with manifestations of punitive power; אֲדֹנָי צְבָאוֹת, a combination not met with elsewhere, similar to the expression found in the Elohimic Psalms, אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת; cf. on the other hand, chap. iii. 15, x. 23, 24. However, the expression אדני צבאות wants the evidence of the Masora,[1] while many codices and editions give יְהוָה צבאות. רָזוֹן (chap. xvii. 4) is a disease contained in the register of curses in Lev. xxvi. 16; Deut. xxviii. 22. Galloping consumption comes like an angel of punishment upon the fleshy lumps of the well-fattened Assyrian grandees; מִשְׁמַנָּיו is personal, as in Ps. lxxviii. 31. And under the glory of Assyria, *i.e.* its expensively equipped army (כָּבוֹד, as in chap. viii. 9), He who makes His angels flames of fire, puts fire so that it passes away in flames. This is expressed in such a way that one seems to hear the crackling and cracking, the spluttering and hissing of the fire as it lays hold round about. This fire, whatever it may be in its natural phenomenal appearance, is essentially the wrath of Jehovah. Ver. 17: "*And the light of Israel becomes a fire, and its Holy One a flame, and it sets on fire and devours its thistles and thorns in one day.*" God is fire, Deut. ix. 3, and light, Ps. xxvii. 1; 1 John i. 5; and in His self-life the former is taken up into the latter. קָדוֹשׁ stands here parallel to אוֹר; for that God is holy, and that He is absolutely pure light, is essentially one and the same thing. The nature of all creatures, and of the whole cosmos, is a mixture of light and darkness. The nature of God alone is absolute light. But light is love. In this holy light of love He has given Himself to Israel to be its own, and He has taken Israel to Himself as His own. But He has also in Himself a principle of fire which sin stirs up against itself, and which now breaks forth as a flaming fire of wrath against Assyria, when committing sin against Him and His people.

[1] For this passage is not included among the 134 instances of וָאו enumerated by the Masora, *i.e.* "real" instances of אדני (not merely instances to be read, but actually written).

To this exterminating power of His penal righteousness the splendid host of Assyria is nothing but a crop of thistles and a tangle of thorns (here this pair of words, peculiar to Isaiah, שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת, is given in reversed order), and as such they deserve to be burned, and are easily made to burn. According to the external appearance it is a forest and a park, but yet irretrievably lost. Vers. 18, 19: "*And the glory of his forest and of his garden field it shall destroy, both soul as well as flesh, that it is as when one mortally sick dies; and the remnant of the trees of his forest will let themselves be numbered, and a boy could write them.*" A forest, יַעַר, and a gardenfield, כַּרְמֶל, represent the army of Assyria, which resembled the former in being composed of many and various peoples, and the latter as glittering in the beauty of its men and armour; it is a forest of men and a park of men, and hence the idea of *penitus* is expressed by the proverbial מִנֶּפֶשׁ וְעַד־בָּשָׂר (which is to be understood in accordance with Gen. xiv. 23; Deut. xxix. 10; Num. v. 3; 1 Sam. xv. 3). This gives occasion for a leap to the figure of the pining away of a נֹסֵס (*ἅπ. λεγ.*, the wasting one, from נָסַס, which comes from the same root-idea in נוּשׁ, אנשׁ, Assyr. *ênêšu*). Bredenkamp puts the words from מנפשׁ to נסס after רזון, and thus obtains two figures that are more distinct from each other (consumption and forest-burning). The two words כְּמָסֹס נֹסֵס depict the melting away, *i.e.* the dying out in the consuming fire of fever, and the representation is not only indicated by their slow movement, but also by their consonance and their accumulated sibilants, in which heavy-breathed expiring life becomes audible. By resuming the first figure the prophecy leads us from the death-bed to the scene of the burning of the forest. The proud beautiful forest is burned down, and only here and there does an isolated tree still tower over the desolate surface. Only a few trees of the forest, easily countable (מִסְפָּר, as in Deut. xxxiii. 6; cf. Isa. xxi. 17), will remain; a boy could count up their numbers, and write them down (compare the lad who is represented as doing much more in writing in Judg. viii. 14). as would be the figures representing the larger cedars of Lebanon which still remain. And so it actually came about; only a remnant of the army that marched against Jerusalem escaped.

The prophet now contrasts with this remnant of a large

destroying power the remnant of Israel, which is the seed of a new power that is rising. Ver. 20: "*And it will come to pass in that day: the remnant of Israel and what has escaped of the house of Jacob will not continue to stay itself upon its chastiser, and will stay itself upon Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, in truth.*" Behind the judgment on Assyria lies the restoration of Israel. מַכֵּהוּ is the Assyrian. Supporting itself upon the Assyrian, Israel was smitten, Jehovah making Israel's supporting stick the rod of His wrath. Thereafter, however, Israel will sanctify the Holy One of Israel by putting its trust in Him and not in man; בֶּאֱמֶת, purely and faithfully, and no longer with hypocrisy and wavering. Then will be fulfilled what the name Shear-jashub promises after there is fulfilled what He threatens, as is seen in the following verse. Ver. 21: "*The remnant will turn itself, the remnant of Jacob, to God the Strong.*" אֵל גִּבּוֹר is He who has become historically manifest in the heir of David, chap. ix. 5. Whereas Hosea (chap. iii. 5) puts Jehovah and the other David side by side, Isaiah thus beholds them in each other.

So then the remnant of Israel will return, but only the remnant to the God who dwells in that son of David (according to the New Testament mode of expression, to God in Christ). Vers. 22, 23: "*For although thy people were as the sand of the sea, the remnant thereof will turn itself: extermination is strictly determined, flowing in righteousness; for a thorough and strictly determined finish the All-Lord, Jehovah of hosts, executes within the whole earth.*" As there is no preceding negation, כִּי אִם do not go together in the sense of *sed* or *nisi;* but, as belonging to two clauses, the words mean *nam, si.* Were the highest number of the people of Israel attained according to the promise, yet will only the remnant among them or of them (בּ, partitively, like בָּהּ in Zech. xiii. 8; 2 Kings ix. 35) be converted; or seeing that the more definite determination *ad Deum* is wanting, come again into their right position. With regard to the mass, extermination is irrevocably decided (חָרוֹן, *τέμνειν*, and then to determine something *ἀποτόμως*, 1 Kings xx. 40); an extermination which is overflowed by righteousness, or better, which flows along (שׁוֹטֵף, as in chap. xxviii. 18), *i.e.* which flowing brings along righteousness, and therefore comes like a swelling

billow of divine righteousness, *i.e.* penal justice. It is not (as Luther translates) uprightness as the fruit of the penal judgment,—a thought which, though appropriate in itself, would not be expressed merely by one word, and it is excluded by the reason given in the following clause. On שָׁטַף with the acc., see Ges. § 138. 2. That כְּלִיוֹן, as in Deut. xxviii. 65, is not used in the sense of perfecting, is shown by ver. 23, where כָּלָה (fem. of כָּלֶה, that which vanishes, then the vanishing, the thorough ending) interchanges with it, and נֶחֱרָצָה designates the judgment as a thing inexorably decided (as in chap. xxviii. 22, and borrowed thence in Dan. ix. 27, xi. 36). Such a judgment of extermination the Almighty Judge is about to execute (עֹשֶׂה in the sense of a *fut. instans.*) within the whole land (בְּקֶרֶב, within, not בְּתוֹךְ, in the midst of), or rather of the whole earth (LXX. *ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ*)—a judgment of the nations of which the judgment on Israel is a central constituent.

In these esoteric discourses it is not, however, the intention of the prophet to threaten and terrify, but to comfort and encourage. Therefore he turns to that portion of the people which is in need of consolation and is receptive of it, and he draws the inference from the element of consolation in what has been prophesied that they may be consoled. Ver. 24: "*Therefore thus saith the All-Lord, Jehovah of hosts: Fear not, my people, which inhabitest Zion, before Assur if it will smite thee with the rod and lift up its stick against thee in the manner of Egypt.*" לָכֵן never means in Hebrew, nor consequently here, *attamen* (Gesenius, Hitzig), but *propterea.* Already the address contained in the words: My people which inhabits Zion, is indirectly encouraging. Zion is, in fact, the site of the divine gracious presence, and of the kingdom which is imperishable according to the promise. Those who dwell there, and who are God's people (God's servants), not merely by their calling but by their inner qualities, are also heirs of the promise; and if the Egyptian bondage becomes renewed in an Assyrian bondage, they may be certain of this to their consolation, that the redemption of Egypt will also be renewed. בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם, in the way, *i.e.* in the manner of the acting of the Egyptians. דֶּרֶךְ is the course both of active procedure and also (as in ver. 26 and Amos iv. 10) of passive endurance.

The encouraging address is now based upon new reasons by taking up again the grounds of consolation from which the לָכֵן derives it. Vers. 25, 26: "*For yet a very little, then is the indignation past, and my wrath turns to destroy them, and Jehovah of hosts shakes over him the scourge as He smote Midian at the rock of Oreb, and His staff reaches out over the sea, and He lifts it up in the manner of Egypt.*" The phrase: a very little (as in chap. xvi. 14, xxix. 17), is meant from the point of view of the ideal present, when Israel is threatened by Assyria with destruction. Then will the indignation of Jehovah at His people suddenly have an end (כָּלָה זַעַם, borrowed in Dan. xi. 36, and to be interpreted according to chap. xxxvi. 20); and Jehovah's wrath becomes or goes forth עַל־תִּכְלִיתָם. Luzzatto recommends the conjectural reading: וְאַפִּי עַל־תֵּבֵל יִהֹם: and my wrath against the world will cease; תבל being taken, as in chap. xiv. 17, with reference to the *οἰκουμένη* as enslaved by the empire. It would be better explained as: "and my wrath at the world will fulfil itself," תֵּבֵל being taken for the sinful world represented by the empire. But the traditional text gives an easier connection for ver. 26. We are not, however, to be misled by the עַל into explaining it as: my wrath (burns) at the destruction inflicted by Assyria on the people of God, or at the destruction endured by that people. It is the destruction of the Assyrians to which Jehovah's wrath is now directed; עַל is used here, as frequently, of that to which the look is directed, that to which the intention points (Ps. xxxii. 8, xviii. 42). When taken thus, ver. 25*b* leads on to ver. 26. The destruction of Assyria is here prophesied in two antithetical figures founded on facts of the olden time. The almighty criminal judge will brandish the scourge over Assyria (עוֹרֵר, *agitare*, as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, in assonance with the following עוֹרֵב), and will smite it after the manner of the smiting upon Midian, chap. xxvii. 7, or of the blow (overthrow) which Midian experienced. The rock of Horeb is the place where the Ephraimites slew the Midian king Oreb (Judg. vii. 25). Then will His staff be over the sea, *i.e.* will be stretched out, like the miraculous staff of Moses, over the sea of tribulation into which the Assyrians have driven Israel (יָם, an emblem borrowed from the type, see Köhler on Zech. x. 11; cf. Ps.

lxvi. 6), and He will lift it up, commanding the waves of the sea that they swallow Assyria. בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרַיִם, a Janus-word, as Cheyne calls it, indicated in ver. 24 how the Egyptians raised it, but here how it was raised over the Egyptians. The expression is intentionally conformed to that in ver. 24: Because Assyria had raised the rod in the Egyptian manner over Israel, Jehovah will also raise it in the Egyptian manner over Assyria.

The yoke of the world-power must then burst asunder. Ver. 27: "*And it will come to pass in that day, its burden will remove from thy shoulder and its yoke from thy neck, and the yoke will be destroyed from the pressure of the fat.*" There are two figures here: in the first (*cessabit onus ejus a cervice tua*), Israel is represented as a beast of burden; in the second (*et jugum ejus a collo tuo*), as a beast of draught; and this second figure divides again into two divisions. For יָסוּר only states that the yoke, like the burden, will be taken from Israel; but חָבַל, that it will itself spring the yoke by the counter pressure of its fat strong neck. Knobel, who alters the text, remarks against this view that the yoke was a cross piece of wood and not a collar. And undoubtedly the simple yoke is a cross piece of wood, but it lies upon the back of the neck of the ox (usually of two beasts yoked together, *jumenta* = *jugmenta*, like *jugum* from *jungere*), where it often rubs deep broad wounds on the nape, and is fastened under the neck by means of a cord, which at the same time connects it with the beam of the plough.[1] It is derived from עָלַל = עָלַל, *inire*, غَلَّ, *immittere*, to let in and close (as by a sort of stoppel, which the Kâmûs explains by حشا, to stop up). The conj. וְחָבֵל עַל is therefore in accord with the thing. But that פְּנֵי שָׁמֶן means "face of the fat," and refers to the head of the fat bullock, is contrary to the linguistic usage, according to which מִפְּנֵי must designate that before which the yoke must yield (cf. *e.g.* Ps. lxviii. 3). We therefore do not get away

[1] Professor Schegg wrote to me after his return from a visit to Palestine, in the year 1866, in these terms: "I saw many oxen at the plough in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and at Ephesus; and the yoke (نير) was always a cross piece of wood laid on the back of the neck of the beast, and connected by a rope under the neck with the beam of the plough."

from the view that what is expressed is a bursting of the yoke produced by the increasing fatness of the ox, the yoke being a cross piece of wood with its connecting rope or strap. Undoubtedly חָבַל is not the most natural word for it; it means a *corrumpi*, but such as has been produced by means of a *disrumpi*, which has resulted, lit., if we compare the Arabic خَبَّلَ, by means of a crumpling, a crushing together, a wrenching. Probably the word was chosen by reference to חֶבֶל, the yoke-rope, although there is no denominative *Pual* in the privative signification of being unroped (Nägelsbach). Kimchi makes the striking remark on this passage, that the yoke usually becomes hurtful to the fat flesh of the ox by pressure and rubbing, but that here the converse case occurs, that the fatness of the ox becomes the means of destroying the yoke (compare the figure of grafting in Rom. xi. 17, to which Paul there also gives a turn *παρὰ φύσιν*). There is no need for a correction of the text by removing חָבַל (Robertson Smith, Bredenkamp). The deliverance comes from within (27*b*) and from without (27*a*). It is no less a consequence of the world-overcoming power which is at work in Israel than a miracle performed for Israel upon the enemy.

The prophet now describes how the Assyrian army advances against Jerusalem without halting, and spreading terror around; and how, like a towering forest planted there, it breaks to pieces before the omnipotence of Jehovah. Eichhorn and Hitzig declare this prophecy to be a *vaticinium post eventum*, because it is too special for any other view. But the Assyrian army when it marched against Jerusalem did not come directly from the north, but from the way to Egypt out of the south-west. Sennacherib had conquered Lachish, then besieged Libnah, and marched thence against Jerusalem. The prophet, however, does not mean to give a piece of military history, but to present vividly the future fact that the Assyrian will advance to Jerusalem after devastation of the land of Judah. One need not object to calling the description ideal, or even poetical (see Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 73). It is not, however, on that account a chimera; for ideas are the essential roots of the real, and reality is their historical and external form. This external formation, their essential manifestation, may,

without detriment to their essentiality, be presented in particular momenta either in one form or in another form. The Assyrian has really come with the storm strides of a conqueror from the north, and the cities named have been really struck by the dangers and terrors of war. The description here given, when looked at aesthetically, is one of the most picturesque and magnificent representations that human poetry has ever produced. Vers. 28–34: "*He comes upon Ayyath, marches through Migron, in Michmash he leaves his baggage. They march right across the ravine;—let Geba be our night-quarters! Ramah trembles; Gibeah of Saul flees; Scream loud, O daughter of Gallim! O only listen, Laysha! Poor Anathoth! Hurries Madmena, the inhabitants of Gebim rescue. To-day he still makes a halt in Nob,—swings his hand over the mountain of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem.—Behold, the All-Lord, Jehovah of hosts, lops down the branches with terrible force, and those of towering growth are hewn down, and the lofty are laid low. And He fells the thickets of the forest with the iron; and Lebanon, by a majestic One it falls.*" The Assyrian suddenly assails עַיָּת, or as the two St. Petersburg MSS. write it, עַיִּת (= עַיָּה, 1 Chron. vii. 28, עַיָּא, Neh. xi. 31, usually הָעַי or עַי), about six German miles to the north-east of Jerusalem (בּוֹא עַל comes hostilely upon, in the same sense as, *e.g.*, Judg. xviii. 27), and in doing so he here steps for the first time upon Benjamite territory that was under the sway of Judah. The name of this ʿAy, which means a heap of stones, agrees with the name of *Tell el-hagar* (van de Velde), which lies at the distance of forty-five minutes' walk south-east from Beitîn = Bethel; but such Arabic translations of the original names of a place as reproduce their recognised original meaning are not to be expected from tradition. Schegg,[1] who made a three days' excursion from Jerusalem for the sake of exploring this Assyrian marching route, and who returned by Teyyiba. Michmash, Geba, Anata, and Isawiya, puts Ay more probably (as the march would then be straightforwards) on the site of the present Teyyiba, six hours' journey to the north of Jerusalem, 2700 feet above the sea, upon an isolated hill from whence a wide view opens up

[1] See the notice of my Commentary in Reusch's *Theolog. Literaturblatt Jahrg.* ii. 80, 81.

towards the lowlands of Jaffa, to the hill of the Franks, over the Gor, and a great part of the Dead Sea, so that the deep blue mirror of its waters and the limestone hills encompassing it are seen nowhere else to such extent from one point of view. The hill, upon which lies the Christian village with about one thousand inhabitants, contains many ruins and the strong foundation walls of ancient fortresses and deep vaults, which point back to early pre-Roman antiquity. We give the preference to this determination of the situation of the place, as there is found in the neighbourhood of Teyyiba a small village with the name of *Chirbet ʿAi*. At this point the Assyrian army could survey the whole of the land yet to be conquered to the south. Instead of turning to the usual great north road (the "Nablus road"), the army marches straight by Michmash to Jerusalem without allowing itself to be delayed by the difficulties of the unlevelled way which led over mountain and valley. From Ay they pass MIGRON, the name of which appears to be preserved in the ruins of *Bury Macrûn*, which lies some eight minutes' walk from Beitîn. MICHMASH (מִכְמָשׁ, according to Norzi, but in 1 Sam. xiii. מִיכְמָשׁ, while in Ezra ii. 27 and Neh. xi. 31 it is מִכְמָס, with ס) still exists as a small village with ruins on the eastern side of the Migron valley under the name of Michmâs. Schegg says of Michmâs: "It lies, like Jerusalem, upon a neck of land between two valleys, the one of which separates it from the tableland on the west and the other from that on the south, on which Geba lies and over which the road to Jerusalem goes. The latter valley running from west to east is not narrow, but it is difficult to cross, deep, and so furrowed, especially near the bottom of the valley, that it requires effort to pass over it. The stream of this Wadi es-Suweinit has scooped through the rock a deep narrow frightful bed about ten minutes' walking to the east of Michmâs. On the right and left, rocks—some of them 100 feet high, perpendicular, naked, and dingy red—form such a narrow outlet that the foaming waters of the winter torrent must still, it appears, struggle to escape. The rocky clefts of Kedron at Mar Saba are roomy valleys compared with this Suweinit. I did not see a rock outlet like it even on Lebanon with all its numerous ravines. Hence this Wadi has been called from of old מְעֻבָּר

מִכְמָשׂ, as in 1 Sam. xiii. 23." After the Assyrians had deposited (הַפְקִיד, Jer. xxxvi. 20) in Michmâs as much of their baggage as they could dispense with—whether in order to leave it there or to have it sent after them by the easier road —they passed over the ford (מַעְבָּרָה, as in chap. xvi. 2), namely, that of the WADI ES-SUWEINIT. If they had marched through this rocky valley lengthwise, this would have led them to the Dead Sea; but they wished to go to Jerusalem, and therefore they cut through the valley and river crosswise. On their difficult march they encourage each other by saying, "GEBA be our night-quarters!" "The beautiful tableland between Geba and Hizma," Schegg further remarks, "was thoroughly fitted for this, and quite inviting; for it is large, fruitful, and even to-day is well cultivated. For the first time I saw here in Judah wide-stretching wheat-fields and beautiful groups of trees which picturesquely shade the surroundings of the little village of Geba." This Geba is now almost universally regarded, according to the view given by Gross, as not the Gibeah of Saul; but the latter is recognised in the towering *Tell* (*Tulcil*) *el-Fûl* which lies more to the south (Robinson, Valentiner, Keil, and others). And rightly so. For this mountain, the name of which signifies "bean-hill," presents a strong position suiting the Gibeah of Saul; and for the view that there were two Benjamite places of the name of גבע, גבעה, or גבעת, there is the evidence of Josh. xviii. 21–28, where גֶּבַע and גִּבְעַת are distinguished from each other. Besides, this mountain, which lies to the south of er-Râm, and therefore between ancient Ramah and Anathoth, fits into the marching route of the Assyrian as here indicated; and it is at least improbable that Isaiah should have named one and the same place first גֶּבַע and then (without any visible reason) גִּבְעַת שָׁאוּל. The Assyrian army therefore took up its night quarters in Geba, which still bears this name; and from there it spread terror to the west and east, and especially to the south. In the morning, having emerged from the deep valley between Michmash and Geba, they leave on their flank the Benjamite RAMA, now er-Râm, which lay half an hour's march west from Geba, and which, trembling, sees them march on. The inhabitants of GIBEATH OF SAUL, lying on the summit of the

"bean-hill" commanding the whole surrounding region, take to flight as they march past. Every station on their route brings them nearer Jerusalem. The prophet lives through it all in the spirit. It is so objectively present to him that it puts him into anguish and pain. The cities and villages of the region are lost. He calls upon the daughter, *i.e.* the inhabitants of GALLIM, to set up a far shrilling cry of woe with their voice (adv. acc. Ges. § 138. 1, R. 3); and to the near-lying LAYSHA (cf. on the two places which have now disappeared, Judg. xviii. 29; and on the personal names, פלטי בן-לַיִשׁ אשר מִגַּלִּים, 1 Sam. xxv. 44) he calls out sympathetically: O, only listen, nearer and nearer come the enemy; and over ANATHOTH (the still existing *'Anâtâ*, which lies three-quarters of an hour's walking to the north-east of Jerusalem, a name which Cheyne regards as that of the Babylonian goddess *Anat*, the wife of *Anu*) he makes this lamentation, taking its name as an omen of its fate: "O, for the poor, Anathoth!" No change of the text is required. עֲנִיָּה, as in chap. liv. 11, is an exclamation, and עֲנָתוֹת follows according to the same order of words as in chap. xxiii. 12; it is a prefixed apposition as in Jer. iii. 6, מְשֻׁבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (compare in the Persian text ای فاخرهٔ بخارا, O, noble Buchârâ, *DMZ.* xxxviii. 330, 331). Ever nearer now to Jerusalem draws the crisis so much to be feared. MADMENA ("dung-heap," see on *Job*, pp. 62, 63) flees in anxious haste; the inhabitants of GEBIN ("water-pits") run off with their belongings; הֵעִיז from עוז, عاذ, to flee (cf. חוּשׁ, and also חָסָה),[1] and therefore to carry away in flight, to bring hastily into safety, Ex. ix. 19, cf. Jer. iv. 6, vi. 1, synonymous with הֲנִיס, Ex. ix. 20, Judg. vi. 11; different from הֵעָז (Prov. xxi. 29, vii. 13), from עָזַז, عزّ, to be firm, strong, defiant, from which is derived מָעוֹז, *mâ'ōz*, a fortification, in distinction from the Arabic معاذ, *ma'âd*, refuge; cf. chap. xxx. 2, "to flee to Pharaoh's fortress," עוז בְּ, like عاذ ب. Neither of these places has left any certain trace

[1] Hardly, however, עוּשׁ, John iv. 11, which probably means, according to LXX. and Targ., *congregari*, and with which Gesenius compared the Arab. غشّ in the erroneously accepted sense of "to hasten."

behind.[1] The passage is usually held to mean further that the army rested another day in Nob. But this is not conformable to the intention of surprising Jerusalem by the suddenness of the destroying blow. Hence we explain it thus: Even to-day he will make a halt in Nob (*in eo est ut subsistat*, Ges. § 132. R. 1) in order to gather up new strength in sight of the city doomed to destruction, and to arrange the plan of attack. The view held, that NOB is the still inhabited village of *el-ʿIsawîya* to the south-west of Anata, fifty-five minutes to the north of Jerusalem, is at variance with the situation as described by Jerome: *Stans in oppidulo Nob et procul urbem conspiciens Jerusalem.* "ʿIsawîya," says Schegg, "lies at the commencement of the valley of that name, which is turned towards the Dead Sea; it is a very lovely place, but is so sunk in the valley, and surrounded on three sides by mountains, that one cannot think at all of identifying it with Nob." Perhaps what is meant is the height which rises on the north of Jerusalem, and which is called *Ṣadr* from its breast-like prominence or convexity. From this height the way leads down into the valley of Kedron, and the city spreads out at a short distance before one going down. It may have been here where the Assyrian is represented as halting in the vision of the prophet. Nor is it long (which is expressed by the יְנִיפֶ֥ which follows ἀσυνδέτως) till, stretching out his hand for a blow, chap. xi. 15, xix. 16, he swings it over the mount of the daughter of Zion (chap. xvi. 1, not בית, in connection with which the writer has thought of הַר בֵּית יְהוָה), over the city of the holy hill. What will Jehovah then do, the only one who can save His threatened dwelling-place from such a host?—Up to ver. 32*a* the discourse has moved in rapid stormy steps; then it begins to linger, and, as it were, to beat with anxiety, and now it breaks forth in dactylic vibrations like a long rolling thunder. The hostile army stands before Jerusalem like a broad thick forest. Then it is shown that Jerusalem has a God who does not allow Himself to be taunted with impunity, nor does He leave His city at the decisive moment in the lurch, like the gods of

[1] A writer in the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1880, p. 108, supposes that Gebim is in the neighbourhood of the caves of the six hundred Benjamites (*Mughâret-el-Gai*).

Carchemish and Calno. Jehovah is the Lord, the God of the spiritual and starry hosts. He smites down the branches of this forest of an army; סָעַף is a so-called *Piel privativum:* to lop off (literally, to deal with the branches, cf. סָקַל, chap. v. 2), and פְּאֹרָה = פֵּאָרָה (in Ezekiel פֹּארָה) means, like the Latin *frons*, both branch and foliage, the leafy branches as the adornment of the tree, or the branches as adorned with leaves. His instrument is מַעֲרָצָה, His terrifying crushing power (compare the verb in chap. ii. 19, 21). And even the lofty stems of the forest, thus stripped of branches and foliage, do not remain standing; hewn down, they lie there, and the tall ones must go down. It goes with the stems, *i.e.* the leaders, as with the branches and the foliage, *i.e.* with the great crowded mass. The whole thicket of the forest (as in chap. ix. 17) He hews down (נָקַף, 3 *p. Piel*, although it may be also *Niphal*), and Lebanon, *i.e.* the army of Assyria, which now stands over against Mount Zion, like Lebanon with its forest of cedars, falls down through a gloriously powerful One, אַדִּיר, *i.e.* through Jehovah (chap. xxx. 21; Ps. lxxvi. 5, xciii. 4). In the history of the fulfilment given in xxxvii. 36, the מַלְאַךְ יי is this אדיר as the organ of the present divine government.

So it goes with the imperial kingdom of the world. When the axe is laid to it, it falls without hope. But in Israel it becomes spring. Chap. xi. 1: "*And there goes forth a sprout out of the stump of Jesse, and a shoot out of its roots brings fruit.*" If the world-power is like the cedar forest of Lebanon, on the other hand the house of David, on account of its falling away, is like the stump of a felled tree (גֶּזַע, *truncus*, from גָּזַע, *truncare*), like a root stock without stem, branches, or crown. But while the Lebanon of the world-power is overthrown so as to remain lying, the house of David becomes young again; and while the former, when it has reached the height of its glory, is suddenly laid low, the latter, when it has reached the utmost danger of destruction, is suddenly exalted. What Pliny says of certain trees in L. xvi. 44: *inarescunt rursusque adolescunt, senescunt quidem, sed e radicibus repullulant*,[1] is fulfilled in the tree of the

[1] The cedar is unlike the oak in that when it is felled it does not send up any shoots. The pine resembles the cedar in this respect according to Herodot. vi. 37: "to destroy like a pine-stem."

Davidic dominion, which has its root in Jesse. Out of the stump of Jesse, *i.e.* out of the remnant of the chosen royal family, which had sunk down to the insignificance of the house from which it sprang ("the fallen tabernacle of David," as Amos expresses it in chap. ix. 11 [1]), there goes forth a sprout, חֹטֶר (خُطْر, from חָטַר, to swing, to sway, *balancer*), which promises to fill up the place of the stem and crown; and below in the roots, covered by the earth and only rising a little above it, there shows itself a נֵצֶר, a little fresh green twig (from נָצַר, נצר, to glance, to blow). The history of the fulfilment has here alluded even to the sound or ring of the prophecy; the at first insignificant and undistinguished נֵצֶר, was a poor despised *Nazarene* (Matt. ii. 23). But that this lowliness of the beginning will not continue is already indicated by the יִפְרֶה, from פרה, to break out and up, to unfold itself, to be or become fruitful, Ex. xxiii. 30. In the humble beginning there lies a power which carries it up to the height with certain progress (Ezek. xvii. 22, 23). The sprout shooting out below the soil becomes a tree, and this tree gets a crown with fruits; and thus a state of exaltation and completion follows the state of humiliation.

Jehovah acknowledges him and consecrates and equips him for his high work with the seven spirits. Ver. 2: "*And the spirit of Jehovah descends upon him, spirit of wisdom and of understanding, spirit of counsel and of power, spirit of the knowledge and fear of Jehovah.*" רוּחַ יְהוָה is the Divine Spirit as the bearer of the whole fulness of divine powers. Then follow in three pairs the six spirits comprehended by רוח יהוה, the first pair of which relate to the intellectual life, the second to the practical life, and the third to the direct relationship to God. For חָכְמָה is the faculty for recognising the essence of things through their appearances, and בִּינָה is the faculty for recognising the distinctions of things through their appearances; the former is *σοφία*, the latter *διάκρισις* or *σύνεσις*. עֵצָה is the gift which enables man to form right resolutions, and גְּבוּרָה

[1] The Messiah is therefore emblematically called בר נפלי, *Sanhedrin* 96*b*: "when will *Bar nafli* come?" Cf. Dalman, *Der leidende und sterbende Messias der Synagoge* (1888), p. 13.

that of putting them energetically into action. דַּעַת ה׳ is the knowledge that is founded in fellowship of love, and יִרְאַת ה׳ is the fear of Jehovah giving itself up to adoration. There are seven spirits which are enumerated from above downwards; for the spirit of the fear of God is the basis of all (Prov. i. 7; Job xxviii. 28; Ps. cxi. 10), and the spirit of God is absolutely the heart of all; it corresponds to the shaft of the seven-flamed candlestick, and the three pairs to the arms that stretched out from it. In these seven forms (see my *Psychology*, pp. 188, 203) the Holy Spirit descends upon the second David for abiding possession; as is expressed here by the *perf. consec.* וְנָחָה, which is accented on the last syllable on account of the following guttural in order to guard against its indistinct pronunciation (cf. Gen. xxvi. 10); נוּחַ, like *καταβαίνειν καὶ μένειν*, John i. 32, 33. The seven torches before God's throne in Rev. iv. 5, cf. i. 4, burn and illumine in his soul. The seven spirits are his seven eyes (Rev. v. 6).

His royal mode of ruling is then also determined according to this his divinely produced, spiritual equipment for his office. Ver. 3: "*And fear of Jehovah is fragrance to him, and he judges not according to outward seeing, and he determines justice not according to outward hearing.*" The translation should not be: His smelling is smelling of the fear of God, *i.e.* the penetrating of it with deep judicial insight (Hengstenberg, Umbreit, and others);[1] nor: His breathing is in the fear of Jehovah (Cheyne), for הֲרִיחַ does not mean "to breathe," and with בְּ it does not mean "to smell something" (as with a following accusative), but "to smell with pleasure" (v. Orelli), like רָאָה בְ, to see with pleasure, or as in Gen. xxix. 32, to see with inward sympathy (Ex. xxx. 38; Lev. xxvi. 31; Amos v. 21). It is not meant that he has as regards himself pleasure in fear of God, but that fear of God when he perceives it in men is fragrance to him (רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ, Gen. viii. 21); for the fear of God is a sacrifice of adoration, continually ascending to God. Brilliant or repellent external qualities do not determine his favour or disfavour; he judges not by the external appear-

[1] So also in *Sanhedrin* 93*b*, whereas R. Alexandri combines הריחו with רחים, and explains it: He (God) has loaded him with duties and sufferings as with millstones (see Dalman, *op. cit.* p. 38).

ance, but by the relationship to his God in the depths of the heart.

This is the standard according to which he will judge in saving and will judge in punishing. Vers. 4, 5: "*And judges with righteousness the insignificant, and passes sentence with equity on the humble in the land, and smites the earth with the staff of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he slays the transgressor. And righteousness is the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his hips.*" The main thing in ver. 4 lies in the objects there presented. He will do right to the דַּלִּים, the weak and helpless, by incorruptibly just procedure against their oppressors; and he will decide with straightness for the humble or meek of the land; עָנְיֵ, like עָנִי, from עָנָה, to bend, the latter meaning one who is bowed down by misfortune, the former one who is bowed down inwardly or emptied of all selfness; הוֹכִיחַ לְ, as in Job xvi. 21. The πτωχοί and πραεῖς will be the very special object of his royal care; just as the first beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount really apply to them. But the earth, *i.e.* the antichristian world and the wicked one (רָשָׁע, not collective, but used as also in Ps. lxviii. 22, cx. 6, Hab. iii. 13, 14, of one in whom the hostility against Jehovah and His Anointed One satanically culminates),[1] will come to experience the force of his punitive righteousness. The very word of his mouth is already a staff which shatters to pieces (Ps. ii. 9; Rev. i. 16), and the very breath of his lips, no further means being required, exercises an annihilating influence (2 Thess. ii. 8)—a feature in the Bible which, as Cheyne remarks, brings the Messiah near the Deity. As the girdle around the loins, מָתְנַיִם (LXX. τὴν ὀσφύν), and forward on the hips, חֲלָצַיִם (LXX. τὰς πλευράς), holds the clothes together,—the unity of the designation, אֵזוֹר, showing that it is not two kinds of girdles that are meant,—so all the qualities and activities of his person have as their connecting bond צֶדֶק, which follows the inviolable norm of the divine will, and אֱמוּנָה, which keeps immovably to the relationship which is instituted by God, and in accord-

[1] In this sense the Targum translates ארמילום, *Armilus*, *i.e.* Ῥωμύλος, *Romulus* (*DMZ.* xxxix. 343), and according to another reading in the *Cod. Reuchlin*, ארמלגון (ארמלגום), which perhaps, as Bucher supposes, means the incarnated *Agramainyus* (Ahriman).

ance with the promise (chap. xxv. 1). The אֱמוּנָה is specially made prominent by the article: he is the true and faithful witness (Rev. i. 5, iii. 14).

The trilogy of the prophetic figures of the Messiah — as about to be born, as born, and as ruling—is now complete. Isaiah was not the creator of Messianic prophecy, as Guthe (in his *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, 1885) tries to prove, forcing the proof by negativing all the Messianic prophecies before Isaiah. An ideal king was hoped for before the expectation was attached to the house of David. But Isaiah and his contemporary Micah raised the outline to a living richly-coloured picture, for which the opening period of the secular empires furnished the basis. With the virgin's son, the five-named king's child, the son of David anointed without measure with God's spirit, there begins a new time in which this king's righteousness attains to a world-conquering position, and finds a home in a humanity which, like him, has risen up out of deep humiliation.

The fruit of righteousness, however, is peace, which now reigns under the government of the Prince of Peace, not only in humanity, but, without being disturbed from any quarter, also in the animal world. Vers. 6–9: "*And the wolf dwells with the lamb, and the pard lies down with the kid, and the calf and lion and fattened ox together—a little boy drives them before him. And cow and bear go to the pasture, their young lie down together; and the lion devours chopped straw like the ox. And the suckling plays on the hole of the adder, and the weaned child stretches his hand to the pupil of the basilisk-viper. They will not become bad, and will not commit destruction in all my holy mountain: for the land has become full of knowledge of Jehovah like the waters covering the sea.*" The Sibyllines, iii. 766 sqq., paraphrase this, and Virgil in his Eclogue perhaps stands unconsciously under the influence of Isaiah through the medium of that paraphrase (Cheyne). The Church Fathers, Luther, Calvin, Vitringa, Schmieder, regard these images from the animal world as symbolical. Rationalistic expositors take them literally, but as a beautiful dream and wish. In the Midrash on Ecclesiastes at chap. i. 9, a real transformation of the animal world is already rejected with אין חדש תחת השמש; but

we have here really a prophecy before us the full realization of which is certainly conditioned by a re-creation, and it therefore belongs to the new earth under the new heaven. Even Reuss refers here to Rom. viii. 19 sqq., remarking that "the idea, at once poetical and sublime, of nature sighing for its glorification, is at bottom only a more ideal form of this same conception." There now reigns in irrational nature, from the greatest beings in it down to the invisibly least, a malevolent strife and fierce delight in carnage. But when the son of David shall have entered upon the full possession and exercise of his royal inheritance, then will the peace of Paradise be renewed, and the truth contained in the popular legends of an *aurea aetas* will be authenticated. It is this which the prophet depicts in charming images. The wolf, formerly scared away from the flock, now keeps good neighbourhood (גָּר) with the lamb; the leopard lets the frisky kid lie down beside it. The lion between calf and fatted ox neither seizes upon the weak neighbour nor lusts after the fat one; a little boy rules the whole three together with his driving staff (נהג, according to Stade, √ נג, *stimulo propellere*). The cow and bear graze with each other, while their young lie together on the meadow. The lion thirsts no more for blood, but, like the ox, is satisfied with chopped food, *i.e.* with cut and crushed straw. The suckling has its delight, *i.e.* enjoys itself (*Pilpel* in the same reflexive sense as in Ps. cxix. 70, from שָׁעַע, to stroke, to caress, to smoothen, *mulcere*) on the hole of the adder; and the child hardly yet weaned boldly and safely stretches his hand to מְאוּרַת צִפְעוֹנִי.[1] From Jer. viii. 17 it is clear that צפעוני is the name of a species of snake; it is, according to Aquila and Jerome in the passage, the *βασιλίσκος*, *serpens regulus* (with which also agrees the Targum and Syr. חִוְרָכָן, *charmana*), according to Schultens from צפע=سفع, to singe by means of the hot breath, but according to Gesenius and Fürst from √ צף, to pipe, to hiss, for which Isidore (*Origg.* xii. 4), *sibilus idem est qui et*

[1] This trait of the Messianic time has been borrowed by a tradition cited by Damîre under the rubric حنش (serpent): "till it come to this that the child puts his hand into the mouth of the serpent without its harming him."

regulus ; sibilo enim occidit, antequam mordeat vel exurat. It is hardly equivalent to צִפְעֹנִי, as it appears according to Saadia, who translates it *er-rakâš*, the spotted (speckled). הָדָה is a *ἁπ. λεγ.*, and the meaning of it is secured by the Arabic هدى, *dirigere, tendere ;* it is cognate in root with יָדָה, *projicere,* from which comes יָד (*hand*). So much the more uncertain is the meaning of the *ἁπ. λεγ.* מְאוּרָה. Corresponding to the parallel חֹר, it appears to mean the hole (Syr. Jerome, LXX. *κοίτη*), whether from אוּר = עוּר, from which comes מְעָרָה, مغارة (there is no word in Arabic of this meaning from a verb beginning with ا); or from אוֹר, the light-hole (as מָאוֹר occurs in the Mishna, *Ohaloth* xiii. 1), or the opening where the hole appears. But it is more probable that מְאוּרָה is something that exercises an attractive power on the child, such as the play of colour, or better, the apple of the eye (Targum), as the fem. of מָאוֹר, the light of the eye (*Erubin* 55*b* = power of seeing). The glance of snakes, and not merely that of the basilisk-lizard but also that of the basilisk-viper, was regarded as having a paralysing and fascinating power. But this terrifying hurtfulness of snakes has now ceased, chap. lxv. 25 ; the basilisk has become so gentle that he lets children catch at his sparkling eyes as if they were precious stones. The prophet thus represents as in an idyl the state of peace of the glorified time which was about to come, and it is requisite to take the thought of the promise in a spiritual sense without adhering literally to the media through which it is expressed. But the representation is more than a drapery thrown around the object ; it is the refraction of the beheld future in the soul of the prophet. But are the animals still to be taken as the subject in ver. 9 ? The subject most naturally suggested is the animals, some of which have just been named as terrible and destructive to men ; and that they are actually thought of as the subject is confirmed in chap. lxv. 25, where chap. xi. 6–9*a* is compendiously repeated. That יָרֵעוּ requires men as the subject is refuted by the usual הָיָה רָעָה (compare the parallel promise in Ezek. xxxiv. 25, which rests upon Hos. ii. 20). That יַשְׁחִיתוּ can be said of animals is evident from Jer. ii. 30, and is at once understood. But if the animals are the subject, then הַר קָדְשִׁי

here is not the hill of Zion (Cheyne), upon which wild beasts never had their lair in historical times, but, as כל indicates, the holy mountain land of Jehovah; and this is just the sense of הר קדשׁי in chap. lvii. 13; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 54; Ex. xv. 17. Further, the fact that peace prevails in the animal world, and that there is also peace between the animals and man, is founded upon the universally prevailing knowledge of God, in consequence of which has ceased that destructiveness of the animal world in relation to man by which alienation from God and apostasy had been previously so often punished (2 Kings xvii. 25; Ezek. xiv. 15, and other passages; see also remarks on chap. vii. 24). The meaning of בכל־הר קדשׁי also determines the extent of the signification of הארץ; it is the land of Israel, the more restricted domain of the government of the son of David, that is meant (Hofmann), which is henceforward, like the paradisiacal centre of the whole earth, a prelude of its future total and perfect glorification (chap. vi. 3, כל־הארץ). It has become full of דֵּעָה אֶת־ה', of that experienced knowledge of Jehovah which consists in fellowship of love (דֵּעָה like לֵדָה, a collateral form of דַּעַת), like to the waters covering the sea, *i.e.* the bottom of the sea (cf. the borrowed passage in Hab. ii. 14, where לָרַעַת is a virtual accusative: full of the knowing). כִּסָּה לְ (like סָכַךְ לְ in Ps. xci. 4) means to afford covering to something; the *Lamed* with a participle readily comes in as a designation of the object, particularly (in Arabic it holds regularly in this case) when it precedes the participle (Ewald, § 292*e*). The omission of the article in the case of מְכַסִּים is an immediate consequence of the inverted order of the words; and generally the attributive participle, when it is in any way more closely determined, can dispense with the article.

The prophet has now described in vers. 1–5 the just ruling of the son of David, and then in vers. 6–9 the peace which under his government extends to the animal world, and which is the consequence of the living knowledge of God having become universal, and which therefore follows from a spiritual transformation of the people subject to him. The matter here indicated is variously enigmatic, and the detail of what it contains and presupposes is unfolded in what follows. Ver. 10: "*And it will come to pass in that day, the root-*

sprout of Jesse which stands as a banner of the peoples, for it shall nations ask, and its resting-place is glory." The proud tree of the Davidic kingdom is hewn down, and only the root has still remained; the new David is שֹׁרֶשׁ יִשַׁי, and therefore in a certain sense that root itself, because it would have long since perished if it had not borne within itself from the beginning Him who now springs forth out of it. But when he who was the One hidden in the root of Jesse as its sap and its power shall have become himself the rejuvenated root of Jesse in the springtide (cf. Rev. xxii. 16), he will be exalted out of this lowly beginning and raised לְנֵס עַמִּים, as a banner, attracting the peoples and uniting them around himself. Thus visible to all the world, he will draw the attention of the heathen to himself; they will turn zealously to him; and his מְנוּחָה, *i.e.* the place where he has settled down to dwell and reign (for the word in this local sense, see Num. x. 33; Ps. cxxxii. 8, 14; the Vulgate, *et sepulchrum ejus*, is contrary to connection and to history), is glory, *i.e.* the dwelling and reigning seat of a king who shines over all, and rules all, and gathers all the nations around him. The people, however, from which and for which this One is primarily king, will, according to the revelation in chap. vi., be scattered away from its native land to a far distance.

How will he be able to reign in the midst of this people? Vers. 11, 12: "*And it will come to pass in that day: again will the All-Lord a second time stretch out His hand to ransom the remnant of His people which will be left remaining, out of Assur, and out of Egypt, and out of Pathros, and out of Ethiopia, and out of ʿElam and out of Sinʿar, and out of Hamâth, and out of the islands of the sea. And He lifts up a banner to the nations and fetches home the outcasts of Israel, and the dispersed of Judah will He gather from the four borders of the earth.*" Assyria and Egypt stand first as the two great powers of the time of Isaiah, and side by side (cf. vii. 18–20). The following were dependencies of Egypt: 1. פַּתְרוֹס, in the hieroglyphics *torēs*, and with article *petorēs*, the southland, *i.e.* Upper Egypt, so that מִצְרַיִם in the narrower sense thus signifies Lower Egypt (see, on the other hand, Jer. xliv. 15); and 2. כּוּשׁ, the country lying still farther south than Upper Egypt on both sides of the Gulf of Arabia. The

following were dependencies of Assyria: 1. עֵילָם, the high land (Assyr. *elamu*), the old Êran (Old Pers. *Airyama, - yama*) to the east of the Tigris; and 2. שִׁנְעָר, the old *Sumêr*, from which the Assyrian kings designated themselves as kings of Sumêr and Akkad (southern and northern Babylonia). These are followed by the Syrian Hamath at the northern foot of the Lebanon, and last of all by אִיֵּי הַיָּם, the islands and coast lands of the Mediterranean with the whole island part of the world (Targ. נְגוֹת יַמָּא, or merely נְגוֹת, cf. Assyr. *nagû*, district, land). There was not yet any such diaspora of Israel at the time when the prophet prophesied, nor even after the dissolution of the northern kingdom; the specialization is prophetical. The redemption which the prophet here prophesies is, in fact, a second redemption, after which there is no third; the banishment therefore out of which Israel is redeemed is the final form of what is threatened in chap. vi. 12; cf. Deut. xxx. 1 sqq. It is the second redemption, the counterpart of the Egyptian one. He will then again stretch out (יוֹסִיף, supply: לִשְׁלֹחַ) His hand, and as He once delivered Israel out of Egypt, so will He now ransom and reacquire it (קָנָה, *opp.* כָּבַר) out of all the countries named. The מִן of the names of countries is to be construed with לִקְנוֹת, which the LXX. translate τοῦ ζηλῶσαι (τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπόλοιπον τοῦ λαοῦ), by which it is meant that He will be zealous in His care for the diaspora; but in the sense of this ζηλοῦν τινα (2 Cor. xi. 2), קִנֵּא is not used *seq. acc.*, but קִנֵּא לְ. In ver. 12*a* it is indicated that the conversion of the heathen becomes the means of the redemption of Israel: the heathen will at Jehovah's beck let His people free and accompany them (chap. xlix. 22, lxii. 10), and thus He will again gather (אָסַף with reference to the one gathering point, and קִבֵּץ referring to the dispersion of those who are to be gathered) even from the uttermost four ends of the world, נִדְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּנְפֻצוֹת יְהוּדָה (= נִדְחֵי, with the *Dag.* dropped before the following guttural as in תִּקְחוּ, שַׁלְחוּ), the outcasts of the kingdom of Israel, and the dispersed of the kingdom of Judah, men and women. This recalls the fact of the present rupture in the unity of the people; but the people brought home again will be a single people in brotherly union. Ver. 13: "*And the jealousy of Ephraim is removed, and the*

adversaries of Judah are extirpated; Ephraim will not vex it jealously against Judah, and Judah will not be hostile against Ephraim." As a suffix and genitive after צָרַר are elsewhere always objective (*e.g.* Amos v. 12), צֹרְרֵי יְהוּדָה does not mean those who are hostile in Judah (Ewald, Knobel, and others), but those who are hostile to Judah (Umbreit and Schegg). On the other hand, the genitive after קִנְאַת may be the *gen. obj.* as well as the *gen. subj.*; but to understand קנאת אפרים of the disinclination of Judah against the more powerful Ephraim (Nägelsbach and Cheyne) is yet hardly possible, as קנאת with the objective genitive is only found in the sense of zeal about something (chap. xxvi. 11; Ps. lxix. 10), and not in the sense of zeal against something. Accordingly we render it thus: the jealousy (passionate hostility) of Ephraim will cease, and if there should nevertheless be found those who oppress (are hostile to) Judah, they fall under the punishment of the הַכָּרֵת, *i.e.* God's immediate judgment יִכָּרְתוּ.

Another question turns upon the relationship of this Israel of the future with the neighbouring peoples: with the warlike Philistines, the predatory nomad tribes of the East, the unbrotherly Edomites, the boastful Moabites, and the cruel Ammonites. Will not these disturb and contract the new Israel as they did the old? Ver. 14: "*And they fly upon the shoulder of the Philistines seawards, unitedly they plunder the sons of the east, of Edom and Moab they take possession, and the sons of Ammon are subject to them.*" כָּתֵף is the proper name of the coast land of Philistia sloping seawards (Josh. xv. 11, כֶּתֶף עֶקְרוֹן); but here alluding thereto it is represented as the shoulder of the body of the Philistine people (בְּכָתֵף = בְּכֶתֶף, see on the cause at chap. v. 2), on which Israel sweeps down from the height of his mountain-land like an eagle. "Object of the outstretching of their hand" is the same as object of their seizure. Whenever henceforth any one of the neighbouring peoples here named attacks Israel, Israel will act in common. But how does this warlike prospect accord with the previous promise of paradisiacal peace, and the end of all war presupposed by it (cf. chap. ii. 4)? This is a contradiction, the solution of which lies in this, that they are only figures, — figures drawn from the present relations of the peoples and their warlike actings, in which the

dominion of the future united people over the neighbouring lands comes into the vision of the prophet.

He lingers still upon the miracles in which the antitypical redemption will resemble the typical one. Vers. 15, 16: "*And Jehovah pronounces the ban upon the sea-tongue of Egypt, and swings His hand over the Euphrates in the glow of His breath, and strikes it asunder into seven brooks, and makes it that men pass through in shoes. And thus a road is made for the remnant of His people which will have remained out of Assur, as there was made for Israel on the day of its marching out of the land of Egypt.*" The two countries of the diaspora which are here first named are Assyria and Egypt. To those who are returning from both and through both, Jehovah miraculously makes a way. The sea-tongue (לָשׁוֹן, as in Josh. xv. 5) of Egypt (יָם־ with *å* retained in the construct state, as is mostly the case),[1] stretching between Egypt and Arabia, is the Red Sea (*sinus Heroopolitanus*, the Gulf of Suez, not as Cheyne supposes, *sinus Aelaniticus*, *i.e.* the Gulf of Akaba). This he lays under the ban (הַחֲרִים, corresponding in meaning to the pouring out of the vial of wrath in Rev. xvi. 12, and a stronger expression than נָעַר, *e.g.* Ps. cvi. 9), the consequence of which is that it furnishes a dry passage for those who are returning. As הַחֲרִים from חָרַם = حرم (with the radical meaning to cut off, to separate, to consecrate), gives a meaning that is unobjectionable, it is unnecessary to read הַחֲרִיב from חָרַב = خرب, or to follow Meier and Knobel, who take הַחֲרִים in the meaning of to split (from חָרַם, Lev. xxi. 18 = خرم). And in order that the cleaving of the Jordan may also have its antitype, Jehovah swings His hand to smite the Euphrates, while He breathes upon it at the same time with glowing breath, so that it is split into seven shallow brooks through which one

[1] The rule is already found in Kimchi, *Michlol*, 205*a*, and following him in Luzzatto (*Gramm.* § 870). The following are the forms both written and spoken, יָם־הַמֶּלַח, יָם־כִּנֶּרֶת, יָם־מִצְרַיִם, יָם פְּלִשְׁתִּים, whereas it is יַם־סוּף on account of the immediately following tone-syllable. It would certainly be correct according to rule to write instead of יָם־, יַם־ with *Metheg*; see Norzi on Gen. iv. 25; Num. xxxiv. 3; and on the placing of *Metheg*, § 11.

can go in sandals. בַּעֲיָם stands, according to the law of euphony, for בְּעָיִם, and the *áπ. λεγ.* עָיִם (with fixed *Kamez*) from עוּם = חוּם, חָמַם, to glow, means a glow, a meaning which, besides, is so well supported by the two Arabic verbs *med. Ye* عام and غام (*inf.* *'aim, ǧaim,* inner glowing, burning thirst, also violent raging), that the conjecture of בְּעֹצֶם (Luzzatto, Gesenius, and Cheyne) is not required. The LXX. translate *πνεύματι βιαίῳ* as if it was written בַּאֲיִם; the Syriac renders it only according to the general sense by *b'uḥdânâ*, with a display of might. Saadia, however, renders it with etymological correctness by *suḥûn*, from *saḥana*, to be hot, kindled. Thus in the (singeing, parching) hot glow of His breath, transforming the Euphrates into seven shallow Wadis, Jehovah makes a free way for His people who come out of Assyria. This is the idea which thus presents itself to the prophet.

Now, as the Israel that was redeemed from Egypt raised songs of praise on the other side of the Red Sea, so likewise does the Israel of the second redemption when brought not less miraculously over the Red Sea and Euphrates. Chap. xii. 1, 2: "*And thou wilt say in that day: I thank Thee, Jehovah, that Thou wast angry against me,* | *Thine anger has turned itself away, and Thou hast comforted me.* | *Behold, the God of my salvation,* | *I trust, and am not afraid;* | *for Jah Jehovah is my pride and song,* | *and He became salvation to me.*" The address is directed to the people of the future as contained in the people of the present. They give thanks for the wrath experienced, inasmuch as it was followed by all the richer consolation. The formation of the sentence after כִּי is paratactic; the principal tone falls upon 1*b* (see on Job iv. 2), where יָשֹׁב is equivalent to וַיָּשָׁב, or, more correctly, where this modal form, followed by וַתְּנַחֲמֵנִי, has included in it a past meaning (cf. Deut. xxxii. 18; Ps. xviii. 12). Driver, § 175, maintains that it is to be translated as an optative: May Thy anger turn away, and mayest Thou comfort us; but it is not till 2*b* that the object for which thanks are given comes to be fully expressed. As נָךְ in Hos. vi. 1 means "he struck," ruled by טָרַף, so here both imperfects are ruled by אנפת, as Cheyne translates: "Thy wrath turned back, and Thou comfortedst me." We hear the sound of the ex-

pressions in Ps. xc. 13, xxvii. 1, breaking through here, but 2*b* is an echo of Ex. xv. 2 (from which also comes Ps. cxviii. 14). עֻזִּי (a collateral form of עֻזִּי) means here the lofty self-consciousness that is combined with the possession of power: pride and its expression, glorification; זִמְרָת is the extended ground form of זִמְרָה = זִמְרָה, and is therefore only in sense equivalent to זמרתי, the suffix of the first word also holding for the second (cf. חֶפְצִי in 2 Sam. xxiii. 5 = חֶפְצִי). Peculiar to this echo of Ex. xv. 2 is the doubling of the יָהּ into יָהּ יהוה, which corresponds to the surpassing of the type by the antitype.

Attaching itself to the introduction in ver. 1, a prophetic promise again appears. Ver. 3: "*And ye will draw water with rapture out of the wells of salvation.*" As Israel drank miraculous water in the wilderness, so will the God of salvation, who has become your salvation, also open to you springs (מְעָיְנֵי, with auxiliary Pathach instead of the otherwise usual מַעְיְנֵי, as we have frequently יַעֲלָצוּ for יַעְלָצוּ) of salvation, many and manifold, in order to draw therefrom with and according to the heart's delight. ישועה is repeated three times as the most striking and comprehensive designation of what arises out of the gracious work of the future for Israel, and through Israel for all the world. For, having attained to the possession of salvation, Israel seeks to put the other nations too into this same blessed possession, and in this sense the promise contained in ver. 3 changes into the psalm tones of the next three verses. Vers. 4–6: "*And ye will say in that day, Praise Jehovah, proclaim His name,* | *make known among the nations His deeds,* | *boast that His name is exalted,* | *harp to Jehovah, for He has displayed majesty,* | *let this be known in all lands.* | *Shout and jubilate, inhabitress of Zion,* | *for great within thee is the Holy One of Israel.*" The first hymn of six lines is followed here by a second of seven lines, a prophetic word of promise introduced between them separating the one from the other. This second hymn of praise also begins with the well-known tones of a psalm; the passage on which הודיעו בעמים עלילתיו is founded is Ps. ix. 12, which has הגידו for הודיעו. The form in which it is put by Isaiah is repeated in Ps. cv. 1, and in the mosaic of 1 Chron. xvi. 8. The phrase קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְ׳ means to make the name of Jehovah the medium of

calling (Ges. 138. 1, R. 3*), *i.e.* to call to Him, or, as here, to call out, exclaim. גְּאוּת is high-towering sublimity; here used of God, as in chap. xxvi. 10, with עָשָׂה: to prove such in fact, as with לָבַשׁ in Ps. xciii. 1, to show oneself publicly in such sublimity. For the *Chethîb* מְיֻדָּעַת in ver. 5, the *Kerî* substitutes the more appropriate Hophal form מוּדַעַת; מְיֻדָּע means the known = familiar one. According to the previous appeals, the sentence is to be taken as expressing a wish that the glorious self-attestation of the God of the history of salvation may be introduced into the consciousness of the whole of the population of the earth, *i.e.* of mankind. When God redeems His people, He has in view the salvation of all the peoples. It is the Holy One of Israel, the knowledge of whom is spread by the word of proclamation, who becomes salvation to them all. How, then, may the Church of Zion rejoice at having such a God dwelling in its midst! Thus closes this second psalm-hymn of the redeemed people, and with it the *Book of Immanuel*. The name of God, קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, with which it closes, is, as it were, the anagram of the author.

PART III.—COLLECTION OF ORACLES CONCERNING THE HEATHEN, CHAPS. XIII.–XXIII.

The Oracle concerning the Chaldeans, the Heirs of the Assyrians, Chap. XIII. 1–XIV. 27.

Just as in Jeremiah, chaps. xlvi.–li., and in Ezekiel, chaps. xxv.–xxxii., so likewise in Isaiah the oracles concerning the heathen stand together. In this respect the three great books of prophecy have the same kind of arrangement. In Jeremiah these oracles disjoined from their *introitus* in chap. xxv. form the concluding part of the collection. In Ezekiel they fill up that interval of time when Jerusalem at home was lying at the last extremity, and the prophet had become speechless on the Kebar of Chaldea. Here in Isaiah these prophecies indemnify us for the interruption which his public labours appear to have undergone in the latter years of Ahaz.

Moreover, this was their most suitable position, following chaps. vii.–xii.; for the great consoling thought of the prophecy of Immanuel, that all the kingdoms shall become the kingdom of God and of His Christ, is here unfolded. And as the prophecy of the Immanuel is given on the threshold of the period of the great empires in order to rule this whole period with its consolation, the oracles concerning the heathen peoples and kingdoms properly belong to it and go with it.

The fact that with chap. xiii. there begins a new part of the whole book, is indicated by the superscription or heading given in chap. xiii. 1: "*Oracle concerning Babel which Isaiah, son of Amos, has beheld.*" מַשָּׂא from נָשָׂא, *efferre*, then *effari*, Ex. xx. 27, means, as is evident from 2 Kings ix. 25, *effatum*, the utterance, particularly the sentence of God; and the term (without introducing the idea of *onus*, according to which it is translated by the Targum, Syr. Jer. and Luther, although, according to Jer. xxiii. 33, they were only scoffers who connected this idea with the word) commonly, although not always, indicates the judicial sentence of God. We see from this superscription that the משׂא בבל originally formed a whole by itself, and that it was handed down to the redactor of the Book of Isaiah as Isaianic, or, at least, that he had grounds for holding it to be Isaianic. And, in fact, the mode of exposition and the whole external character impressed upon it accords in many respects with those prophecies which are undoubtedly Isaianic; and Zephaniah and Jeremiah appear to stand in a relation of dependence to this משׂא בבל, a relation which cannot be inverted without conflicting with the admittedly mosaic work in Zephaniah and the imitative character of Jeremiah (see on this, Caspari in the *Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1843, 2). Ezekiel, too, in chap. xxxi., where he holds up before the land of Pharaoh the fate of the Asiatic empire as a mirror, appears to fuse together recollections of this משׂא בבל and of other prophecies which are recognised as the genuine productions of Isaiah (cf. *e.g.* chap. xxxi. 16 with Isa. xiv. 8; and chap. xxxi. 10–14 with Isa. x. 33–34). The lamentation and the funeral song over the king of Egypt in Ezek. xxxii. is regarded by Ewald and Cheyne as the original, which has been imitated by the author of the משׂא בבל. But there are reasons for holding to the originality

of the משׂא בבל: Ezekiel may be said to pick particular passages out of it (compare chap. xxxii. 7, 8 with Isa. xiii. 10; and chap. xxxii. 28 with Isa. xiv. 19), and these he expands in his own way of working details into more comprehensive pictures. However, we do not overlook the weight of the one ground opposed to this view, namely, that this prophecy concerning Babylon (Babel) has no historical contemporaneous attachment in Isaiah's own time. It is true that Isaiah had become certain in the time of Hezekiah (as chap. xxxix. shows; cf. Micah iv. 10) that it was not Assyria that would be the executor of the final judgment on Judah, but Babylon, which was already at that time the second capital city of the Assyrian kingdom and the seat of dependent kings who were striving for independence, and that it was thus a Chaldean kingdom. But that Jehovah, as in the case of Assyria, would avenge His people on Babylon through a Median (Medo-Persian) empire, which was to arise after the Chaldean empire, and that He would thus redeem the exiles, is a consolatory hope for which a prophet of the beginning of the Babylonian exile is better fitted to be the organ than Isaiah, for whom, as for Micah, Babylon, as the mistress of the world, formed the farthest bound of his horizon, and who did not yet proclaim the fall of Nineveh, as Nahum and Zephaniah afterwards did for the first time.

The prophet hears a summons to war. From whom it proceeds, and to whom or against whom,—still remains secret; but this makes the anxiety the more intense. Ver. 2: "*On unwooded mountain lift ye up a banner, call to them with loud-sounding voice, shake the hand, that they may enter into gates of princes.*" The pronoun לָהֶם precedes, and the naming of those to whom it refers follows, as, for instance, in Deut. xxxiii. 2, 3. The summons is pressing, and hence a threefold signal: the staff of the banner planted in order to be widely visible on a "bared" mountain (נְשָׂפָה, from which comes שְׂפִי, only found in Isaiah and Jeremiah); the voice raised high; and the waving of the hand, which implies a violent beckoning—all three signs being favourite ideas with Isaiah. The destination of this *arrière-ban* is the marching into a city of princes (נְדִיבִים, freemen, nobles, princes, Ps. cvii. 40; cf. cxiii. 8), that is to say, they were to march in as conquerors; for

it is not the princes who call them thither, but He who summons them is Jehovah. Ver. 3: "*I have summoned my consecrated ones, also called my heroes to my wrath, my proudly exulting ones.*" לְאַפִּי is to be explained in accordance with chap. x. 5. To execute his wrath, he has commanded his מְקֻדָּשַׁי, *i.e.* (according to Jer. xxii. 7; cf. the dependent passage, li. 27, 28) those who were already solemnly consecrated to march to battle, and called his heroes whom he had taken into his service, and who, even while exulting in the intoxicating pride of victory, are his instruments (apparently borrowed in Zeph. i. 7; cf. iii. 11). עַלִּיז is a word peculiar to Isaiah (xxii. 2, xxiv. 8); and the combination עַלִּיזֵי נַאֲוָה is so unusual that it is hardly to be expected in two writers who stand out of relation to each other.

The command of Jehovah is speedily executed. The great army is already moving down from the mountain. Vers. 4, 5: "*Hark, tumult upon the mountains after the manner of a great people; hark, uproaring of kingdoms of nations met together! Jehovah of hosts musters an army. Those have come out of a far land from the end of the heaven: Jehovah and His instruments of wrath, to destroy the whole earth.*" קוֹל opens an interjectional proposition, and thereby becomes itself almost an interjection (compare lii. 8, lxvi. 6, and on Gen. iv. 10). On the mountains there is a rumbling uproar (chap. xvii. 12, 13); for they are the peoples of *Eran*, and at their head the Medes, who inhabit the very mountainous part of Eran to the north-east of Babylonia, who descend over the lofty *Shahu* (Zagros) and the mountain chains lying towards the Tigris and stretching down to the Babylonian lowlands; and not merely the peoples of Eran, but generally the peoples of the mountainous north of Asia (Jer. li. 27). It is an army under the guidance of Jehovah, the God of the hosts of spirits and stars, whose wrath it is about to execute on the whole earth, *i.e.* on the kingdom of the world; for the fall of Babylon is a judgment, and it is accompanied with judgments upon all the peoples under the Babylonian government.

Then must all sink into anxious and painful terror. Vers. 6–8: "*Howl, for the day of Jehovah is near, like a destroying force, from the Almighty it comes. Therefore all arms hang slack down, and every human heart melts away. And they*

become disturbed, they fall into cramps and pangs, like a travailing woman they writhe; one stares at the other, their faces are faces of flame." The outcry, הֵילִילוּ (not defectively, הֵלִילוּ), LXX. ὀλολύζετε (cf. Jas. v. 1), is founded on the expression "the day of Jehovah is near," which, from the time of Obadiah and Joel, was the watchword of prophecy. The כְּ in כְּשֹׁד is the so-called כ *veritatis, i.e.* of the comparison of the concrete with its idea (chap. xxix. 2; Song of Sol. viii. 10), or of the individual with the universal or common which is manifested in it (see Ezek. xxvi. 10; Zech. xiv. 3; 2 Sam. ix. 8; Neh. vii. 2); it is a destroying by him who possesses unlimited power to destroy (שֹׁד from שָׁדַד, שדד, to ram, to attack in a violently destructive way, from which we have שַׁדַּי, according to the form חַנִּי from חָנַן). In this play of sound the prophet repeats words of Joel (i. 15). He himself uses שַׁדַּי nowhere else as a name of God. On that day men let their hands hang down from despondency and helplessness, and the heart, the seat of life, dissolves (chap. xix. 1) in the heat of anguish. Universal consternation ensues, as is here expressed by the וְנִבְהָלוּ standing in half pause (*shalsheleth*, with the mark of separation after it). The following paragogic imperfects increase the energy of the description by their anapaestic rhythm. Men (this is the subject) are seized by cramps and pangs (as in Job xviii. 20, xxi. 6), the force of events compelling them to enter into these states (cf. chap. xxxv. 10). The cramps are called צִירִים from צוּר = צָרַר, like *tormina*, from *torquere*, and the pangs and throes חֲבָלִים from the חָבַל, حبل, which is related in meaning to צר (cf. حبل, to be pregnant, literally, *semen in se constrictum habere*). The pains are indicated in their order of succession, which is here expressed by יְחִילָן (from חִיל = חול, حال, to turn oneself, to writhe). Further, their faces are faces of flame. What is here meant is the fever glow of anguish, which drives the blood into their face, so that it becomes deep red and glowing hot (compare the expression for deadly paleness in Joel ii. 6).

Jehovah's day of wrath is coming,—a starless night, a night-like, sunless day. Vers. 9, 10: "*Behold, the day of*

Jehovah comes, a cruel one, and indignation and glowing wrath, to turn the earth into a wilderness; and its sin it abolishes from it. For the stars of the heaven and its Orions will not let their light gleam; the sun darkens itself at its rising, and the moon does not let its light shine." The day of Jehovah comes, cruel and severe (אַכְזָרִי, an *adj. relat.*, fr. the elative form אַכְזָר), as the overflow of inner excitement and as sheer glowing wrath. לָשׂוּם is carried on in the finite verb. It is, indeed, not the judgment of the world which the prophet is describing, but a historical catastrophe of the nations drawing the whole earth afar into sympathetic suffering; הָאָרֶץ is here not merely the land of Babylon (Knobel), but the earth. That the day of Jehovah is a day of wrath is established in ver. 10. Even nature clothes itself in the colour of wrath, the opposite of which is light. The heavenly lights above the earth are extinguished; the moon does not shine; the sun in the act of rising changes its mind. That כְּסִיל, in the sense of "the fool = foolhardy one," indicates Orion, which is according to the old translations (LXX. ὁ Ὠρίων, Targum נְפִילֵיהוֹן from נְפִילָא, in the same astrological sense), is more probable[1] than that it indicates in the sense of "the tardy one," *suhêl*, *i.e.* Canopus (see on Job ix. 9, xxxviii. 31), although the Arabic *suhêl* occurs as the generic name for stars of prominent splendour (see on Job xxxviii. 7). The comprehensive signification of the term is similar to the use of הַבְּעָלִים in Hos. ii. 15, 19, as applying to Baal, Astarte, and the bull images taken together; or as when in Arabic (according to a figure of speech which is called تغليب, *i.e.* the letting the *pars potior* predominate) "the two late evenings" are used for evening and late evening; "the two Omars" for Omar and Abubekr (*DMZ.* vii. 180–81), and *Sibaweihs* for Sibaweih and the grammarians like him, exactly as in Latin we have Scipiones = men of the greatness of Scipio. Even the Orions, *i.e.* the stars, which at other times beam most brightly (cf. σείρια παμφανόεντα in

[1] So when the astronomical R. Samuel of Nehardea, *Berachot* 58*b*, says: "Were it not for the heat of the כסיל, the world could not exist on account of the cold of the עקרב (Scorpion);" and, conversely, he means by כסיל Orion. The sense of the saying is that the constellations Orion and Scorpio, of which the one appears in the hot season and the other in the cold, maintain an equilibrium in the relations of the temperature.

a fragment of Ibykos), withhold their light; for when God is angry, the principle of anger stirs also in the natural world, and indeed primarily in the stars which were created לְאֹתוֹת (compare Gen. i. 14 with Jer. x. 2). Instead of יְגִיהַּ, Ezekiel in chap. xxxii. 7 says יְאִיר.

The prophet now hears again the voice of Jehovah, which reveals to him what is His purpose—a visitation punishing the wicked, humbling the proud, and depopulating the lands. Vers. 11, 12: "*And I visit on the world the evil, and upon evil-doers their guilt, and sink into silence the pomp of the inflated, and the show of the tyrants I throw to the ground. I make men more costly than fine gold, and people than Ophir-jewels.*" The verb פָּקַד is, as in Jer. xxxii. 2, construed with the accusative of what is punished, and with עַל of him who is punished. Instead of אֶרֶץ we have here תֵּבֵל, which is always used in the manner of a proper noun (never with the article, nor in plural) of the earth without limitation. Instead of נְדִיבִים we have here עָרִיצִים, like רָשָׁעִים in Job xxi. 28; the former means only princes, having only sometimes the collateral sense of despots; the latter signifies primarily ferocious men or tyrants, and it occurs frequently in Isaiah. The typical impress of Isaiah is here unmistakable. "What is high is thrown down" is one of the chief themes of Isaiah's proclamation. It is one of the fundamental thoughts of Isaiah, that the judgment only leaves a remnant (שְׁאָר); and this thought also runs through the oracles concerning the heathen (chap. xvi. 14, xxi. 17, xxiv. 6), and is variously represented (chap. x. 16–19, xvii. 4–6, xxiv. 13, xxx. 17). Here the thought is expressed by indicating that men will be as scarce as the finest kinds of gold. כֶּתֶם from כָּתַם = כָּמַם, to conceal, is literally hiding, and then, what is kept hidden on account of its preciousness. Isaiah is fond of painting in tones, and the אוֹפִיר, which resembles אוּקִיר in sound, is—according to what is still always the most probable view—the gold region of India, which lay nearest the Phoenicians, the coastland of *Abhîra*, east of the mouths of the Indus (see Comm. on Gen. x. 29; Job xxii. 24; and as to the Egyptianized *Σουφίρ* of LXX., see Comm. on Job xxviii. 16).

The wrath of God thus rules on earth among men, thus

casting down and rooting out; and the natural world above and below cannot remain unaffected by it. Ver. 13: "*Therefore I set the heavens a-quaking, and the earth trembles away from its place, because of the fury of Jehovah of hosts, and because of the day of His glowing anger.*" In 13*a* there is an echo of Job ix. 6 (cf. xx. 27). The two בְּ (cf. ix. 18) are used causatively. They correspond to the עַל־כֵּן as its explication. Because God's wrathful judgment is inflicted upon men, every creature which is not the object of that judgment of wrath must yet become a means of carrying it out. It is the thought of ver. 9*a* which is here repeated in a sort of refrain (similarly as in chap. v. 25). Now follow the several fatalities. The first is flight. Ver. 14: "*And it happens as with a gazelle which is scared, and as with a flock without a gatherer, they turn every one to his people, and they flee every one to his land.*" The subj. of וְהָיָה is כ *instar*: there happens the like of, or the same as with a scared gazelle. Babylon, the "shopkeepers' city of the merchants' land" (Ezek. xvii. 4), was the world market of inner Asia, and therefore a gathering place of the most diverse nationalities (Jer. l. 16; cf. li. 9, 44), the rendezvous of a πάμμικτος ὄχλος, as Aeschylus says in his *Persae*, v. 52. This great and motley mass of strangers scatter hurriedly away on the fall of the imperial city (chap. xlvii. 15; Jer. l. 16, li. 9). The second fatality is violent death. Ver. 15: "*Every one who is found is thrust through, and every one who is overtaken falls by the sword.*" הַנִּמְצָא are those who are found in the city by the inrushing conquerors; and הַנִּסְפֶּה are those who are caught by them in flight (סָפָה, chap. vii. 20, to snatch away). All are slaughtered. The third and fourth fatalities are plundering and ravishing. Ver. 16: "*And their sucklings are dashed in pieces before their eyes, their houses plundered, and their wives ravished.*" Instead of תְּשֻׁגַּלְנָה, the *Kerî* has here and in Zech. xiv. 2 euphemistically תְּשָׁכַבְנָה, *concubitum patientur*, a passive which, like the Pual of the *Kerî* of Jer. iii. 2, nowhere appears in the Old Testament text itself (see Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 407, 408). The queen's name, שֵׁגָל, and the odalisque's name, שֻׁנֶּמֶת, in Dan. v. 2, 3, show that שגל was not regarded as ignoble in the ancient period of the language.

With ver. 17 there begins a new turn of the prophecy in

which the obscurity thus far lying upon it is completely broken through. We now learn the name of the conquerors. Ver. 17: "*Behold, I rouse upon them the Medes, who regard not silver, and have no pleasure in gold.*" The Medes are called מָדַי, the old Bactrian *Mâda*, the Assyrian *Mada-a-a* (without marking of the first syllable as long). The Persians, who are first named by Ezekiel and Daniel, are not mentioned here; the prophet who ascribes the fall of Babylon (538 B.C.) to the Medes, prophesies, as the statement shows, before Cyrus made himself the master of the Median empire (549 B.C.) by conquering Astyages. The Medes lived till about the end of the reign of Hezekiah, in country districts containing regions (villages) organized in a constitutional way. After they had broken away, in 714 B.C., from the Assyrians, they put themselves, in 709–8 B.C., under a common king, named Deyoces, or more correctly, under a common monarch. But the proper founder of a Median kingdom was Cyaxares, 633–593 B.C., who was followed by Astyages (593–549 B.C.). The "kings of Media" appear, in Jer. xxv. 25, among those who must drink the cup of revelling, which Jehovah presents through Nebuchadnezzar to the peoples. Their expedition against Babylon was thus an act of revenge for the disgrace of servitude brought upon them. The fact that they did not esteem silver and gold (חָשַׁב, *aestimare*, and indeed *magni*, as in chap. xxxiii. 8, and frequently elsewhere) is not meant to mark them as a rude uncivilised people, but the prophet means it in the same way as Cyrus in Xenophon, *Cyrop.* v. 120, when he says to the Medes: *οὐ χρημάτων δεόμενοι σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐξήλθετε.* Revenge incites them on even to ignore all morality and humanity. Ver. 18: "*And bows smite down young men; and on the fruit of the body they have no compassion, on children their eye has no pity.*" The bows do not stand exactly for the bowmen (see chap. xxi. 17); but the bows of the latter smite down the youths by means of the shot arrow. The fruit of the body they do not spare, since they kill the sucklings, and even rip up the bodies of women with child (2 Kings viii. 12, xv. 16, and elsewhere). They feel no emotion of pity or consideration even towards children; no such emotion is keeping them back or expressing itself in their look (Prov.

xxi. 10); חוּם, related to حاش, from which comes حَاشَ, *absit* = חָלִילָה, here, as in Ezek. v. 11, used of the eye as the mirror of the soul (cf. 1 Sam. xxiv. 11, where עיני is to be supplied).[1] With such inhuman excesses on the part of the enemy, the capital of the empire becomes a scene of terrible conflagration. Ver. 19: "*And Babel, the ornament of kingdoms, the glory of the pageantry of the Chaldeans, becomes like Elohim's judicial overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah.*" The ornament of מַמְלָכוֹת is so called because it is the centre of many subjugated kingdoms which now take their revenge upon her, ver. 4; and she is called the glory or pride (cf. xxviii. 1) because the ancient seat of a mighty and far-ruling people. Its present catastrophe is compared to that of Sodom and Gomorrah; the two אֵת are in the accusative; מַהְפֵּכָה, *καταστροφή*, is used like הֲיָעָה in chap. xi. 9 with a verbal force (*τὸ καταστρέψαι*), and the LXX. render it well *ὃν τρόπον κατέστρεψεν ὁ θεός* (cf. on the arrangement of the words, Ges. § 133, 3).

Babylon, like the cities of the Pentapolis, is now an everlasting wilderness. Vers. 20–22: "*She remains unoccupied for ever, and uninhabited to generation of generations; and an Arab does not pitch tent there, and shepherds do not make lie down there. And beasts of the desert lie down there, and hyenas fill their houses, and ostriches dwell there, and field-devils hop about there. And jackals howl in her castles, and wild dogs in palaces of pleasure: and her time is near to come, and her days will not be prolonged.*" A city sits and dwells when it is settled and inhabitable, and has therefore a settled population (cf. *e.g.* Zech. ix. 5). Babylon thus becomes a ruin. The conclusion is similar to the conclusion of the prophecy against Edom in chap. xxxiv. 16, 17; there the certainty of what is prophesied is asserted to the most individual details; here the nearness of the fulfilment is asserted. The fulfilment, however, did not take place so soon as may appear from

[1] This is not connected with خشية العين على (*Hariri*, p. 140, *Comment.*), in which العين is not *gen. subjecti*, but *n. act.*, and which means: Anxiety lest his sons should be smitten by the evil eye; literally: Anxiety of ogling for his sons (see the remark above on ii. 6).—Fl.

the words of the prophecy. According to Herodotus, Cyrus, the leader of the Medo-Persian army, left the city still standing with its double ring of walls. Darius Hystaspis, who was forced to conquer Babylon a second time in 518 B.C., had the walls taken away all but 50 ells. Xerxes gave the last blow to the glory of the temple of Belus. Conquered by Seleucus Nikator (312 B.C.), Babylon fell in proportion as Seleucia arose, and Seleucia even inherited the name of the city it surpassed.[1] *Babylon*, says Pliny, *ad solitudinem rediit exhausta vicinitate Seleuciae.* In the time of Strabo (born 60 B.C.), Babylon was a complete desert; and he applies to it (xvi. 15) the words of the poet: *ἐρημία μεγάλη 'στιν ἡ μεγάλη πόλις.* Consequently prophecy shows itself here too as subject to the law of perspective foreshortening. But the curse, to the effect that Babylon should never come again to be settled and inhabited (a poetical expression, as in Jer. xvii. 25, xxxiii. 16), proved itself effective when Alexander wished to make Babylon the metropolis of his empire; he was carried off when engaged at it by an early death. Ten thousand workmen were at that time employed for two months in clearing away the rubbish from the foundation of the temple of Belus (the Nimrod Tower). The fact that there is now found, not far from the Birs Nimrud, a considerable and pleasant town named Hilla, is not contrary to 20*a*; for the prophecy means Babylon, the city of imperial power. In ver. 20*b* it is said that no Arab (עֲרָבִי, from the old Semitic עֲרָבָה, עֲרָבָה, a steppe, used here for the first time, and then in Jer. iii. 2 = עַרְבִי, Bedouin, from עָרַב, a desert) pitches his tent there (יֶהֱלֶ, different from יָהֵל in chap. xiii. 10 and Job xxxi. 26, is syncopated from יֶאֱהַל, *tentorium figet*, like the Assyrian אהל=אאל, to settle down, to camp), is the natural consequence of the great field of ruins which is supplied only with scanty vegetation. General Chesney found at the foot of the Birs Nimrud a tribe of Arabs encamping there; and this is indeed against the letter of the prophecy, but not against its sense;—the field of ruins is not a pasture-land where

[1] Stephanus Byz.: Βαβυλὼν Περσικὴ πόλις μητρόπολις Σελεύκεια καλουμένη.

nomads could remain. In depicting this desert field the prophet names all sorts of beasts of the desert and of waste places that make their haunts there. The series opens with צִיִּים (from צִי, dryness = צִיּוּן, or from צִיִּי, *adj. relat.* of the noun צִי), *i.e.* inhabitants of the desert, here not men, but, as in most instances, beasts, yet without its being possible to determine those which are specially so designated. It was a plausible conjecture of Aurivillius, that אֹחִים meant long-eared owls (*Uhu's*); but the Assyrian *âḫû* (syn. *barbaru*) is in favour of a four-footed beast.[1] On בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה, see Comm. on Job xxxix. 13—18; Wetzstein combines יַעֲנָה with وعنة, a desert; Ewald, on the other hand, compares the Syriac יענא, greedy, devouring. The feminine plural includes the ostriches of both sexes, just as the אִיִּים (sing. אִי = אִיִּי from אָוָה, عوى, to howl), *i.e.* jackals, are called in Arabic, without distinction of sex, بنات آوى, and in the vulgar dialect واوى. תַּן (see Köhler on Mal. i. 3) has also been regarded since Pocock and Schnurrer as a name of the jackal; for which the Arabic name for the wolf, *tinân* (which is only incidentally so used), gives less authority than the Syriac translation by יָרוּקָא (*e.g.* in Jer. ii. 24, where the Targum has יָרוֹקָא);[2] it may designate a variety of the species *canis aureus*, from the characteristic mark of its being stretched out long (whether from length of the trunk, or of the snout, or of the tail).[3] The animals named, the quadrupeds (רָבַץ) as well as the birds (שָׁכַן), are actually still found there on the ground and soil of ancient Babylon. When Ker Porter was approaching the Nimrod Tower, lions were sunning themselves quietly upon its walls, and they came down leisurely when alarmed by the cries of the Arabs. And, as Rich heard in Bagdad, the site of the ruins is still regarded as a rendezvous for ghosts; שָׂעִיר, in distinction from עַתּוּד, signifies the full-grown shaggy he-goat, but here שְׂעִירִים (as in

[1] See Friedr. Delitzsch, *Hebrew Language* (1883), p. 34.

[2] Just as strange is the way in which ר and ד interchange in the Talmudic צבחר, and the Palestinio-Aramaean צבחד (a bit, a little). The transition of the ð *spirans* into *r* is also found in the sphere of the Arian languages, *DMZ.* xxxvi. 135, 136.

[3] W. Robertson Smith mentions in the accounts of his journey to Hijaz that the fox is there called *abu-ḥosein*, and the jackal ثعلب.

chap. xxxiv. 14) are demons in the shape of goats to which the heathen offered sacrifices (Lev. xvii. 7 ; cf. 2 Chron. xi. 15). Virgil, like Isaiah, calls them *saltantes Satyros.* In the present day the nightly howling and yelling of jackals (עָנָה after רִקֵּד, as in 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7) still produces its weird disconcerting effect upon the traveller there. These are the future inhabitants of the royal אַרְמְנוֹת, which the prophet (cf. Targ. Ezek. xix. 7) with a sarcastic touch calls אַלְמָנוֹת, on account of their witheredness and desolation (although אלמנה is shown to be only different in sound from ארמנה by the Assyrian *almattu* = *almantu*).[1] These are to be the inhabitants of the הֵיכְלֵי עֹנֶג, the luxurious villas and chateaux or pleasure mansions, with their hanging gardens. The fulfilment is put in prospect in ver. 22*b* as in the near future. עֵת (hardly contracted out of עֵנֶת from עָנָה = אָנָה, to meet, a meaning for ענה which has no certain support, but out of עֵדֶת from יָעַד, to determine)[2] signifies the final term of fulfilment. The Apocalypse in chap. xviii. 2 takes up this prophecy of Isaiah and applies it to a then existing Babylon, which has to look at itself in the mirror of the Babylon of old.

It is love to His own people which drives the God of Israel to suspend such a judgment of eternal destruction over Babylon. Chap. xiv. 1, 2: "*For Jehovah will have mercy on Jacob, and will once more choose Israel, and will settle them on their native soil ; and the foreigner will associate himself with them, and will attach themselves to the house of Jacob. And peoples take them and accompany them to their place, and the house of Israel makes them its own on the soil of Jehovah as servants and maid-servants, and they hold captive those who led them away captive, and become lords of their oppressors.*" We have here *in nuce* the comforting substance of chaps. xl.–lxvi. Babylon falls in order that Israel may rise. God's compassion brings this about. He chooses Israel עוֹד, *iterum* (as in Zech. i. 17, ii. 16), and therefore concludes with it a new covenant. Then follows restoration to the possession of their country (אַדְמָתָם), of the land of Jehovah (אַדְמַת ה׳, as

[1] See Friedr. Delitzsch on Baer's *Ezekiel*, p. xi.

[2] Similar to this pair of derivatives, עֵת and מוֹעֵד, are עֵצָה and מוֹעֵצָה, יְקוֹד and מוֹקֵד ; cf. v. Orelli, *Zeit und Ewigkeit*, pp. 47–49.

in Hos. ix. 3). The proselytes from the heathen who had attached themselves to Israel (נִלְוָה, as in Zech. ii. 15, parallel to נִסְפַּח), march with them as Ruth went with Naomi. Heathen accompany the exiles to their locality and place. And the relation between them is now reversed. Those who accompany Israel are now taken possession of by them for themselves (הִתְנַחֵל, used reflexively, like הִתְפַּתֵּחַ in chap. lii. 2 λύεσθαι) for servants and maid-servants, and they (the Israelites) become leaders into captivity of those who led them captive (לְ, with the participle, as in chap. xi. 9), and they will rule over those who were their oppressors (רָדָה בְּ, as in Ps. xlix. 15). The promise literally refers to this world, in accordance with the national form of the Old Testament community, and will not be realized in this its literal sense. Israel, indeed, will be restored as a people; but the essence of the Church which is raised above all national distinctions does not return to the national limit which it has broken through. The fact that the prophecy moves within this limit here is explained at once from the fact that it is primarily deliverance from the Babylonian exile that is promised.

The song of the redeemed is a song on the fall of the king of Babylon.[1] Vers. 3, 4*a*: "*And it comes to pass on the day when Jehovah brings thee rest from thy torment, and from thy anguish, and from the heavy servitude wherewith thou wast made to serve, then thou raisest such a triumph-song over the king of Babel, and sayest.*" Instead of the Hiphil הֵנִיחַ (to let down, to set down, as in Gen. ii. 15) of ver. 1, we have here, as in the original passage in Deut. xxv. 19, the more usual form הֲנִיחַ, in the sense of to give rest, to procure rest. עִצֶּב is trouble which torments (as עָמָל is trouble which presses heavy), and רִגְזֶ, agonizing restlessness (Job iii. 26; cf. Ezek. xii. 18). The assimilated מִן before רִגְזֶ is not מִ, as in מֵעִצֶּב, but מִ, with a virtual duplication (*Michlol*, 54*a*), as elsewhere before ח, ה, and also before ר in 1 Sam. xxiii. 28; 2 Sam. xviii. 16. In the relative clause אֲשֶׁר עֻבַּד־בָּהּ, אֲשֶׁר is not the Hebrew *causus adverb.*, corresponding to the Latin ablative,

[1] In Bungener's *Un sermon sous Louis XIV.*, Bossuet is represented as saying: "What beauty! Were the author a poet, I would say: that is his masterpiece!"

quâ servitute servo te usi sunt; it is conceived as *acc. obj.*, according to Ex. i. 14 and Lev. xxv. 39, *qu'on t'a fait servir*, as in Num. xxxii. 5, *qu'on donne la terre* (Luzzatto). Delivered from such a yoke of servitude, Israel will raise a מָשָׁל. מָשָׁל, according to its primary general meaning, is exposition or representation, *i.e.* oratorical exposition (from מָשַׁל = מָשַׁל, to exhibit, put oneself forward), thoughtful and pregnant speech, figurative speech, and generally poetry, but more particularly gnomic poetry, with a liking for what is emblematic and piquant; and from this the idea of the satirical is easily combined with the term.

The song is addressed to the Israel of the future in the Israel of the present, as in chap. xii. 1. The former will then sing and say, vers. 4*b*–6: "*How it is over now with the tyrant, over with the place of torture! Jehovah has broken to pieces the rod of the wicked, the ruler-staff which smote peoples fiercely with blows without ceasing, wrathfully subjugated nations with pursuing that never pauses.*" The *ἅπ. λεγ.* מַדְהֵבָה is derived, by Parchon, Kimchi, Ben-Melech, Vitringa, Aurivillius, and Rosenmüller, from the Aramaean דְּהַב, *aurum;* but this was never thought of by any of the ancients. The latter all translate the word as if it were מְרַהֵבָה (arrogant, violent treatment, from רהב, chap. iii. 5), as it has been mostly corrected since J. D. Michaelis. But we come to this result without changing a letter, if we take דְּהַב = דּוּב דָּאַב, meaning to flow away, to pine away. The מ is the local מ, as in מַדְמֵנָה, chap. xxv. 10, and therefore the place where they reduce to pining away, *i.e.* Babylon, as a house of servitude where Israel has been made weary to death. The ruler-staff in ver. 5 is the Chaldean imperial power concentrated personally in the king of Babylon (cf. שֵׁבֶט in Num. xxiv. 17); the ruler is termed מֹשֵׁל, as standing upright and bearing the sway (*kâim bi-l-mulki*), just as the parable is called מָשָׁל, as a (comparative) exhibition or exposition. Here the associated idea of the tyrant is connected with מֹשֵׁל. That tyrant-sceptre smote peoples with incessant smiting and hunting of them; with מַכָּה is connected, as the accusative of manner, the derivative מַכַּת, and with רֹדֶה is connected in cognate sense מְרֹדָף, that which (*ὅ*, *τι*) is hunted, then this that

(ὅτι) there is hunting, and as the meaning of the passive participle passes into that of the verbal abstract: the being hunted, a Hophal noun, as in chap. viii. 23, xxix. 3. Döderlein's conjecture of מְרֻדָּת is ingenious but unnecessary.

Unceasing continuance is expressed first by בְּלֹתִי, which is used as a preposition, and is followed by סָרָה, which is a participial noun like בָּלָה, and then it is expressed by בָּלִי, which is construed as in Gen. xxxi. 20, Job xli. 18, with a finite verb; for בְּלִי חָשְׂכָה is an attributive clause: with a "being hunted" which did not hold itself in, made no halt, and therefore did not spare. But it is not Israel only and other subjugated peoples that now breathe again. Vers. 7, 8: "*The whole earth is quiet, is at rest; they break forth into jubilation. Even the cypresses rejoice because of thee, the cedars of Lebanon: 'since thou hast fallen asleep, there will not come up one who lays the axe to us.'*" The preterites indicate inchoatively the circumstances into which the whole earth has now entered. The want of a subject with פָּצְחוּ gives the greatest generality to the bursting out of jubilation; פָּצַח רִנָּה, *erumpere gaudio*, is an expression exclusively Isaianic (*e.g.* in chaps. xliv. 23, xlix. 13). מֵאָז also in historical prose signifies "since" in a relative conjunctional sense (*e.g.* Ex. v. 23); and it is peculiar to our prophet to draw the trees of the forest into the general joy as living and speaking beings (cf. lv. 12). Jerome understands the trees here figuratively as *principes gentium*. But the disposition to allegorize not only destroys the reality of the contents, but also the colouring of the poetry. Cypresses and cedars rejoice, because the Chaldean has behaved so badly when among them in employing the almost imperishable wood of both for building ornamental structures, for carrying on sieges, and for constructing fleets. They even made ships of them, as Alexander, for example, built for himself a fleet of cypress wood, and the Syrian ships had masts of cedar. Of the thousand-year-old cedars of Lebanon, which at a moderate height are distinguished by the circumference of their trunk (being about 14·56 metres at breast high), there are only some seven still remaining, while the number of all the trunks goes considerably beyond 350. The old botanist Rauwolff, in the year 1573 (according to the account of his travels published in 1583), counted only 24.

While it has now become quiet on earth, on the other hand the nether world is found in the most violent agitation. Ver. 9: "*The kingdom of the dead below falls into uproar on account of thee at thy coming; it stirs up for thee the shades, all the he-goats of the earth; it raises up from their throne-seats all the kings of the nations.*" The mythological idea of Hades proceeds on the twofold truth, that what and how man has been in this world is not obliterated in the other world, but becomes essentially manifest, and that there is an immaterial self-formation of the soul in which all that the individual man has become through his own self-determination under God-given relations is reflected as in a mirror, and that in an abiding figure. This image of the soul, to which the dead body is related as the shattered form of a mould, is the shadowy corporeity of the inhabitants of Hades, in which they appear essentially, although in the condition of spirits, as what they were in this life. The prophet depicts this poetically; it is truly a מָשָׁל which he here inweaves in his prophecy. The greatest astonishment and excitement lay hold of the whole of Hades now when the king of Babel approaches, the invincible ruler of the world, who was not expected, or, at least, not so soon. From עוֹרֵר onwards, שְׁאוֹל, although feminine, might be the subject, since the verb turns from the feminine form into the original masculine form; but it is better to take the subject as neuter, a *nescio quid*, a nameless power; for were שְׁאוֹל to be taken as the personified Sheol with allusion to the heathen god of the nether world (such as Nergal, the *šar apsi*, king of the water deep, Job xxvi. 5), then רְגָזָה would have to be altered into רָגַז (*DMZ.* xxvi. 793). A sudden shock runs through the inhabitants of the still land, especially those who were formerly the leading goats or bell-wethers of the herds of peoples, so that they bound up from astonishment.

And what do they call out to the lofty new-comer as he approaches? Ver. 10: "*They all begin and say to thee: Thou also hast been made weak the same as we; thou art become like us!?*" This verse only contains the address of the shades. The Pual חֻלָּה, only used here, meaning to be made sickly or powerless, signifies the being transposed into the state of the רְפָאִים (a word occurring in Phenician inscriptions, from רָפָא =

רָפָה, to be slack, weary); for the life of the shades is only a shadow of life (cf. *εἴδωλα*, *ἄκικυς*, and *κάμοντες* in Homer). We cannot expect more than this expression of highest amazement in Hades. Why should they taunt their new associate? From ver. 11, accordingly, the singers of the Mashal again take up the song. Ver. 11: "*Thy splendour is hurled down to the realm of the dead, the sounding of thy harps; maggots are spread under thee, and they who cover thee are worms.*" We learn from the Book of Daniel the nature of the Babylonian music, which was rich in instruments, partly of a foreign kind. Maggots and worms—a bitter sarcasm—now take the place of the artistic and costly Babylonian carpets as the pillows and coverings of the noble corpses. יֻצַּע might be a 3rd pers. imperfect Hophal (Ges. § 71), but here between perfects it is 3rd pret. Pual, like יֻלַּד in chap. ix. 5 (Aben Ezra). רִמָּה, which is preceded by the verb in a masculine, and, to some extent, indifferent form, is the collective name of small worms which corruption brings with it (from רָמַם, רוּם, to be rotten, putrid), LXX. *σῆψις*. With אֵיךְ, the catchword of the Mashal, it goes on in ver. 12: "*How art thou fallen from the heavens, thou shining star, son of the dawn, smitten down to the earth, who threw nations down from above!*" הֵילֵל (which elsewhere as the imp. Hiphil of the verb יָלַל means *ejula*) here means the glittering star (from the quadriliteral הילל, *hailala*, an intensive form of הלל, to shine), *i.e.* the morning star, which Babylonians and Assyrians personified in the feminine as Istar,[1] but of which they said: "Istar is feminine at sunset and masculine at sunrise."[2] To the idea of the morning star as a male messenger of the sunrise, corresponds the surname בֶּן־שַׁחַר; just as according to the Greek myth he is son of Eos, because he rises before the sun and swims in

[1] *Istar* is originally goddess of the morning star (like العزى of the ancient Arabians, *DMZ.* xli. 710); and not till later, after the suppression of *Sin*, did she become the Moon-goddess, and the planet Venus was thenceforth represented by *Bilit* (*Baaltis*), the ancient goddess of the evening star (see Schrader in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1874, 337, 340; *DMZ.* xxvii. 403; *Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie*, i. 127). On the mythus of איסטהר being transferred to the Pleiades, see *DMZ.* xxxi. 225–229.

[2] See Friedrich Delitzsch on Smith's *Chald. Genesis*, p. 271.

the morning red, or rather in the morning grey (for this is the literal meaning of the שַׁחַר, שָׁאכַר, in distinction from נֹגַהּ, the red dawn), as if he were born out of it. Lucifer, the name of the devil, is derived from this passage, the reference of which to Satan is designated by Luther as *insignis error totius papatus;* but it is found already in Jerome and other Fathers. The designation is exceedingly appropriate for the king of Babylon, because of the Babylonian culture going back to the grey primeval time, and on account of its astrological character. The additional name assigned to him, הוֹלֵל עַל־גּוֹיִם, arises from the idea of the *influxus siderum;* הוֹלֵל means laying low, as in Ex. xvii. 13, and with עַל, bringing overthrow (חֻלְּשָׁה) upon; . . . whereas the Talmud (*Shabbath* 149*b*) takes it in the sense of מטיל גורל (*projiciens sortem*), and explains the חֹלֶל (= פּוּרָא, lot) of the Mishna by it.

A look is now thrown back at the self-deification of the king of Babylon, in which he is the antitype of the devil and the prototype of Antichrist (Dan. xi. 36; 2 Thess. ii. 4), a self-deification which has found its reward. Vers. 13–15: "*And thou, thou hast spoken in thy heart: 'The heavens will I ascend, high above the stars of God exalt my throne, and sit down on the mountain of the assembly of gods in the corner of the north. I will mount up to cloud-heights, make myself equal to the Most High,'—nevertheless thou art hurled down into the realm of the dead, into the corner of the pit.*" With וְאַתָּה there begins, as in ver. 19, an antithetical circumstantial clause: whilst thou, whereas thou. The הַר מוֹעֵד cannot be Zion, as Schegg and others suppose, misled by Ps. xlviii. 3; Zion was certainly neither a north point of the earth, nor did it lie in the north of Jerusalem. The prophet makes the king of Babylon speak according to the ideas of his people, who had not, like Israel, the seat of the Deity in their midst, but transferred it to a mountain-range in the farthest north, the Arâlû, as the Hindus transfer it to the fabulous northern mountain Kailâsa lying beyond the Himalaya, and the Eranians to the Alburǵ which bounds the earth to the north. There in the north, on the Arâlû, the mountain of the lands (*šad mâtâtê*), *i.e.* at whose feet lie the lands or countries of the earth, according to the Babylonio-Assyrian notion, the gods had their home, their habitation,

the seat of their dominion.[1] יַרְכָתַיִם (from יָרֵכָה with suffix יַרְכָתוֹ) are the two sides of a thing into which it sunders, the two legs of an angle, and then the apex where the legs separate. So here יַרְכְתֵי צָפוֹן is the farthest point of the north from whence the northern mountain chain stretches fork-like into the land; and יַרְכְתֵי־בוֹר is the inmost part of the pit into which it slopes with its two walls, and from which it gapes or widens. All the foolhardy purposes of the Chaldean are embraced ultimately in אֶדַּמֶּה לְעֶלְיוֹן, just as the Assyrians (which, however, is not yet established by the inscriptions) according to Ktesias, and the Persians according to the *Persae* of Aeschylus, called their king God, and the Sassanidae actually call themselves *bag ΘΕΟC* on coins and inscriptions. אֶדַּמֶּה is Hithpael = אֶתְדַּמֶּה, with the usual assimilation of the preformative ת. With אַךְ, in ver. 14, a contrast is drawn between the pride of the Chaldean flying to the far lofty mountain range towards the north, and to the heavens above, and his inflicted punishment dragging him deep down to the pit. אַךְ, originally affirmative and then restrictive (as רַק is originally restrictive and then affirmative), passes here to an adversative meaning, as in Ps. xlix. 16 and Job xiii. 15 (a transition which אָכֵן shows still more frequently): nevertheless thou wilt be hurled down; nothing but that will occur, and not what thou proposest. This prophetic תּוּרַד is not appropriate either in the mouth of the inhabitants of Hades or in the mouth of the Mashal-singer. The address of Israel has here imperceptibly passed into the words of the prophet, who has before him, but still in the future, what the Mashal sings of as already past.

The subject is also carried on in the tone of prophecy. Vers. 16, 17: "*Those who see thee look thoughtfully, look meditatively at thee: 'Is this the man who set the earth quaking, kingdoms shaking? He who made the world a wilderness, and threw down its cities, and did not let away his captives to their home?'*" The scene is no longer in Hades (Knobel, Umbreit). Those who thus speak have the Chaldean before them, not as a weary shade, but as an unburied corpse that has passed into corruption. הַשְׁגִּיחַ means the

[1] See Friedr. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 118. Alfred Jeremias, *Babyl. assyrische Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 59 sqq.

thoughtful fixing of one's attention upon something. As תֵּבֵל is feminine, the suffixes in ver. 17 refer, according to a *constructio ad sensum*, to the *οἰκουμένη* as transformed into כִּדְבָּר. פָּתַח, to open, namely, lock and fetters, here joined with בַּיְתָה, is equivalent to releasing and letting away (syn. שִׁלַּח, Jer. l. 33). Among the captives the Jewish exiles are particularly referred to; and it was their release that had never entered the mind of the king of Babylon.

The prophet, into whose own words the words of the spectators have passed, then tells of the state in which the tyrant now lies, a state which calls forth such earnest reflections. Vers. 18, 19: "*All the kings over nations, all of them are laid away in honour, every one in his house; but thou art cast away far from thy sepulchre like a shoot hurled forth, clothed over with slain ones, those thrust through by the sword, those that go down to stones of the pit—like a carcase trodden under foot.*" Every other king lies after his death בְּבֵיתוֹ, in the confines of his residence, but the Chaldean lies far from the hereditary vault which seemed destined for him. The מִן in מִקִּבְרֶךָ means away therefrom, as in Zeph. iii. 18; cf. Prov. xx. 3; Num. xv. 24. He lies there like a נֵצֶר נִתְעָב, *i.e.* like a side shoot cut off from the tree and thrown away with disgust, because ugly, useless, and only prejudicial to the development of the tree; נִתְעָב, pregnant: *cum abominatione abjectus*. The Targum takes נצר figuratively, and translates פִּיחַט טְמִיר as a buried abortion (Job iii. 16). The scene which here rises before the mind of the prophet is the field of battle. In order to clear it, a hole has been made, and stones are thrown upon it without the trouble being taken of shovelling it up (אַבְנֵי־בוֹר); but the king of Babylon remains lying like a branch which, when a tree is pruned, is let lie aside unheeded, and is trodden into the mire. The following לָבֻשׁ is also a participle; he comes to lie in a common grave deep below other bodies gathered from the battle-field. There he lies then like a carcase (פֶּגֶר), trodden down and deserving nothing better than to be trodden down (מוּבָס, part. Hophal from בּוּס, *conculcare*). He is not buried with other kings and like other kings. Ver. 20: "*Thou art not united with them in burial, for thou hast ruined thy land, murdered thy people; seed of evil-doers is not named for ever.*"

With them, *i.e.* the מלכי גוים of ver. 18*a*. He does not come to lie where kings are entombed with royal honours, not in "his grave," ver. 19*a*, the royal place of burial. Vengeance is thus taken because he has tyrannically spoiled and exhausted his country, and because he has made his people the mechanical instrument of his lust of conquest, and sacrificed them. And it is not merely with himself that all is over for ever; it is also so with his dynasty. The prophet, the messenger of the punitive righteousness, and the mouth of the omnipotence which shapes history, commands it. Ver. 21: "*Prepare for his sons a slaughter-house because of the iniquity of their fathers. They shall not rise up and conquer lands, and fill the face of the world with cities.*" The exhortation is addressed to the Medes, if the prophet is to be considered as having particular persons in his mind. After they stormed Babylon by night, the new Babylonian kingdom and royal house of Nabopolassar disappeared from history; the last shoot of the royal house of Nabopolassar was slain when a child by conspirators; and the second Nebuchadnezzar "deceived the people by declaring: I am Nabukudraćara the son of Nabunita"—as Darius says in the great inscription of Behistan. בַּל (poetical for אַל, like בְּלִי in xiv. 6, for לֹא) is the expression of a negative wish (as פֶּן is of a negative intention). A Babylonian kingdom shall never arise again. Hitzig (*Psalms*, ii. 89) corrects עָרִים into עִיִּים, "heaps of ruins," which is approved by Cheyne, who renders it "heaps;" Ewald makes it עָרִיצִים (tyrants); Meier, עֲרִים, which is made to mean conflicts; and Maurer, like Knobel (in editions 2, 3, whereas in ed. 1 he preferred to read רָעִים), gives עָרִים, which is to be taken, not in the sense of cities, but of enemies (see on Ps. cxxxix. 20). Nothing of all this, however, is necessary. Nimrod built cities in order to strengthen his monarchy. The king of Assyria built cities for the Medes in order to keep them better in check. It is this building of cities as a means of subserving tyrannical government that is meant.

Thus far the prophet speaks as from God. The prophecy concludes with a word of God Himself given forth through the prophet. Vers. 22, 23: "*And I will arise against them, saith Jehovah of hosts, and root out in Babel name, and remnant, and sprout, and shoot, saith Jehovah. And I make it the*

possession of hedgehogs and water-marshes, and sweep it away with the besom of destruction, saith Jehovah of hosts." שֵׁם וּשְׁאָר and נִין וְנֶכֶד are two alliterating proverbial pairs of words in the alliterative style, and they express the whole without exception. Jehovah rises against the descendants of the king of Babylon, and entirely exterminates Babylon root and branch. The destructive powers, which Babylon hitherto could control by artificial protection, are let loose. The Euphrates, now undyked, lays the territory of Babylon under water. Hedgehogs then take the place of men, and morasses the place of palaces. אֲגַם, أَجَم (أَجَمَة), means here stagnating marshy waters, see chap. ix. 13. קִפֹּד appears indeed in chap. xxxiv. 11 and Zeph. ii. 14 associated with birds, but it signifies in all the Semitic dialects the hedgehog (LXX. ἔρημον ὥστε κατοικεῖν ἐχίνους), which can roll itself together (√ קף, קפף, *comprehendere, comprimere*), and which, although it can neither fly nor climb very well, being a plantigrade, yet it can easily get on the capital of an overturned pillar (see Zeph. ii. 14). The concluding threat makes a *tabula rasa* of Babylon. From the Pilpel טְאטֵא (or, according to Kimchi, *Michlol*, 150*a b*, טַאטֵא, according to which the codices and old editions read וְטַאטֵאתִיהָ), מַטְאֲטֵא means something with which one drives forth or sweeps away—a besom (a word which was preserved in the popular speech of Palestine, according to *Rosh ha-shanah* 26*b*). Jehovah treats Babylon as sweepings (טִיט, Babylonio-Assyrian *ṭîṭu*), and sweeps it away, הַשְׁמֵד (a substantively used infinitive absolute) serving him as besom.

There now follows a short passage about Assyria, which apparently stands unconnected here. Vers. 24–27: "*Sworn has Jehovah of hosts, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it be; and as I have resolved, it takes place: to break Assur to pieces in my land, and upon my mountains I will tread him down: then departs from them his yoke, and his burden will depart from their neck. This is the purpose which is purposed concerning the whole earth; and this the hand which is stretched out over all the nations. For Jehovah of hosts has resolved, and who could bring to naught? And His hand that is stretched out, who can turn it back?*" It is a quite different judicial

catastrophe that is presented here from that which is prophesied in chaps. xiii. 2–xiv. 3. The world-power which it falls upon is likewise also called, not "Babel" or "Kasdim," but "Assur," which cannot be taken as a name of Babylon (Abravanel, Lowth, and others). Babylon falls by the Medes. Assyria, on the other hand, perishes in the mountain land of Jehovah, which it seeks to subdue; so it was fulfilled. Only when this had taken place did a time come for a prophecy against Babylon, the heiress of the broken Assyrian empire. The two prophecies against Babylon and Assyria therefore form, as they here stand, a hysteron-proteron. The thought which occasioned this conjunction of them, and which it is intended to set forth, is expressed by Jeremiah thus: "Behold, I punish the king of Babel and his land as I have punished the king of Assur" (Jer. l. 17, 18). The one event is the precursor and guarantee of the other. This prophecy against Assyria is, as it were, the pedestal upon which the משׂא בבל is placed. For this it was doubly appropriate, on account of its epilogical tone from ver. 26 onwards.

The Oracle concerning Philistia, Chap. XIV. 28–32.

The punishments enumerated in 2 Chron. xxviii. 5–21 as falling upon king Ahaz, also included the one represented here of the Philistines invading the low country (שְׁפֵלָה) and the south land (נֶגֶב), taking several cities, of which the chronicler mentions six by name, and settling therein. This aggressive rising of the Philistines against the government of Judah was probably a consequence of the oppression of Judah by Syria and Ephraim, or of its continued weakness from its sufferings in the Syro-Ephraimitish war. However it be, the fact suffices of itself to enable us to understand the following minatory prophecy.

This prophecy belongs to those which are dated. Ver. 28: "*In the death-year of king Ahaz, the following oracle went forth.*" The death-year of Ahaz is (as in chap. vi. 1) the year in which the death of Ahaz occurred. The Philistines, without being again humiliated, were still holding possession, a fact which was shameful to Judah. But this year was also a turning-point. For Hezekiah, the successor of Ahaz,

not only wrested from them the conquered cities, but also smote them completely within their own territory (2 Kings xviii. 8).

It was therefore a very decisive year in which Isaiah began thus to prophesy. Ver. 29: "*Rejoice not so completely, Philistia, that the staff which smote thee is broken to pieces: for out of the serpent's root goes forth a basilisk, and its fruit is a flying dragon.*" The death-year of Ahaz was exactly the death-year of Tiglath-pileser (726 B.C.), or it was close to it. Hence Barth, with Nöldeke assenting, understands by the broken staff the castigating rod of Tiglath-pileser; whereas Bredenkamp, on the other hand, takes it to refer to Shalmanassar. On that view, the basilisk and the flying dragon would have to be understood to be kings of Assyria, as Cheyne and Driver take them to be. Philistia had really to suffer from Sargon and Sennacherib, according to the evidence of the inscriptions. But the superscription of the prophecy does not run בשנת מות המלך תגלתפלאסר (שלמנאסר, but בשנת מות המלך אחז. Shall we then hold it to be an erroneous marginal addendum written by some one or other (as Cheyne and G. A. Smith[1] hold), and thus support one hypothesis by another hypothesis? No. The point at issue stands in the same position as that in chap. xv. 9. What Philistia suffered through Sargon and Sennacherib stands only in a preparatory relation to the lasting subjection under Judah which the prophet hopes for. שִׁבְטֵ֣ מַכֵּ֔ךְ, *scipio feriens te* (not *ferientis te*, which is less suitable), is the Davidic sceptre which held the Philistines in subjection under David and Solomon, and in later times since Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 6). This sceptre is broken to pieces; for the Davidic kingdom is broken by the Syro-Ephraimitish war, and it has not yet recovered itself, and it has fallen to pieces in so far as it had extended its power over the neighbouring peoples. It is about this that Philistia is wholly filled with joy; but this joy is at an end now. The power from which Philistia had withdrawn itself was a common serpent, נָחָשׁ, which, besides, is now cut to pieces, or has died down to the root. But out of this root, *i.e.* out of the house of David, which had been reduced to the lowli-

[1] In the first volume of his work, *The Book of Isaiah* (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1888), which has just reached me (Jan. 1889).

ness of its original stem, there grows forth צֶפַע (see chap. xi. 8), a basilisk *regulus* (Jerome and other old translators); and this, which is already dangerous and deadly in itself, will when matured bring as fruit a winged dragon—a beast of the popular mythology, although Herodotus (ii. 75) speaks of winged serpents in Egypt and Arabia. The basilisk is Hezekiah, and the flying dragon is the Messiah (such is the explanation of the Targum); or what is the same thing, the former is the Davidic kingdom of the immediate future, and the latter the Davidic kingdom of the ultimate future. The figure may appear inappropriate, because the serpent is a symbol of evil; but it is not a symbol merely of creaturely evil, but also of the divine curse; the curse, however, is the energy of penal justice, and as the executor of this justice as a judgment of God on Philistia, the Davidic king is here called a serpent in a climax rising through three stages. Perhaps the choice of the figure was suggested by Gen. xlix. 17; for the saying concerning Dan was fulfilled in Samson the Danite, the sworn enemy of the Philistines.

The coming Davidic king is for Israel peace, but death for Philistia. Ver. 30: "*And the poorest of the poor will feed, and needy ones lie down in peace; and I kill thy root by hunger, and thy remainder he lays low.*" בְּכוֹרֵי דַלִּים is an intensified form of בְּנֵי דַלִּים, the latter meaning those who belong to the race of the poor, the former (cf. Job xviii. 13, *mors dirissima*) those who occupy the first rank in this race; it is a designation for Israel as deeply, very deeply reduced and at present threatened on all sides, but as afterwards enjoying his country in quiet and peace (Zeph. iii. 12, 13). In this sense וְרָעוּ is used absolutely, and the conjecture of Lowth, בְּכוֹרַי, or of Koppe and Hupfeld, בְּכָרַי, is not required. Israel again comes up, but Philistia goes down to its root and remainder, and even this falls on the one hand under the penal infliction of God (famine), and on the other hand under the punishment inflicted by the house of David. For the change of persons in 30*b* is not a synallage; יַהֲרֹג has for its subject the basilisk, the father of the flying dragon, and not the hunger (as Nägelsbach holds); for the hunger is only one of the means of punishment which take effect upon Philistia.

The Massa consists of two strophes. The first threatens

judgment from Judah, and the second, beginning here, threatens judgment from Assyria. Ver. 31: "*Howl, gate! Cry, city! Thou art getting to melt away, Philistia, entirely; for from the north comes smoke, and there is no isolated one among its bands.*" שַׁעַר elsewhere is always masculine, but here (cf. Song of Sol. vii. 5) it is used in the feminine as a local name. The world-renowned strong gates of the Philistine cities (especially of Ashdod and Gaza), and the cities themselves, shall lift up a cry of woe (cf. Lam. ii. 18 if the text there is uncorrupted), and Philistia, which was hitherto all joy, must wholly perish in the fire of anguish (chap. xiii. 7); נָמוֹג is the inf. abs. Niphal (cf. lix. 13; König, *Lehrgeb.* p. 473) with subject following, as in Ezek. i. 14 with it preceding. It falls into the state of complete dissolution, for from the north there comes a singeing and burning fire which already announces itself from afar by the smoke; it is an all-devastating army out of whose bands (מוֹעֵד, after the form מוֹשָׁב, is the mass assembled at the מוֹעֵד, *i.e.* the determined place, Josh. viii. 14; 1 Sam. xx. 35, for a determinate object) no one separates himself from weariness or self-will (cf. chap. v. 27); and therefore it is an army without a gap, animated by one striving, namely, the desire of conquest. And this it cannot possibly have only with a view to the Philistine strip of coast, the conquest of which is rather merely a means for securing possession of the countries on the right and left. The question then rises, what will happen to the land of Judah from the fire which is rolling along from the north? For the fact that the prophet of Judah threatens Philistia with that fire, presupposes that Judah is not also consumed by this fire.

It is this which is expressed in ver. 32: "*And what answer do the messengers of the peoples bring?—That Jehovah has founded Ziōn, and that the afflicted of His people are hidden therein.*" The מַלְאֲכֵי־גוֹי are the ambassadors of the several neighbouring nations who were sent to Jerusalem after the Assyrian army was destroyed before Jerusalem, to ascertain for themselves how it had fared with that city. The question may be explained: And what answer is given (יֵעָנֶה with the most general subject) to the messengers of the nations? or, and what do they proceed to say, *i.e.* what

information do the messengers of the nations bring (singular of the predicate with the plural of the subject, as in chap. xxx. 20; Ezek. xiv. 1; Esth. ix. 23, and elsewhere)? but however it is explained, there is always a certain hardness in the expression. The answer, however, is to this effect: Zion, protected by its God, has remained unshaken; and the people of this God, the poor and despised community of Jehovah (cf. Zech. xi. 7), exists and knows that it is concealed in Zion. The prophecy is enigmatical and oracular. Prophecy speaks to the other peoples otherwise than to Israel. To the former its language is dictatorially brief, self-consciously elevated, loftily poetical, and peculiarly coloured, according to the special character of the people to which the oracle refers. The following prophecy against Moab makes it clear to us that in the view of the prophet the judgment which Assyria executes on Philistia prepares for the subjugation of Philistia again under the sceptre of David. By the wreck of the imperial power of Assyria at Jerusalem, the house of David again recovers its old supremacy round about. And so it actually happened. But the fulfilment was not lasting and not exhaustive. Jeremiah therefore (Jer. xlvii.) takes up the prophecy of his predecessor anew in the time of the Chaldean judgment of the nations. But he only takes up its second strophe; the Messianic element of the first is continued by Zechariah (Zech. ix.).

The Oracle concerning Moab, Chaps. XV., XVI.

Looked at in its relation to the neighbouring peoples, the kingdom of Israel began victoriously and gloriously. Saul made them richly compensate for their previous offences against Israel (1 Sam. xiv. 47), and the Moabites among them. David subdued the Moabites completely (2 Sam. viii. 2). After the division of the kingdom, the northern kingdom entered into possession of Moab. The Moabites delivered tribute of their flocks to Samaria. But when Ahab died, Mesha, the king of Moab, withdrew from this obligation to pay tribute (2 Kings i. 1, iii. 4 sqq.). The memorial stone found among the rubbish on the field of Dibon is dedicated to the commemoration of his struggles for the independence of

Moab. It has an inscription of thirty-four lines in the language and character of the ancient Hebrew, and it contains at least seven of the Moabite names of places which appear in this מישׁא.[1] Ahaziah of Israel did nothing to subdue Mesha again. In the meantime the Moabites, allied with other nations, made an attack upon Judah also; but the allies destroyed each other; and Jehoshaphat celebrated in the valley of Beracha the victory which he gained without a battle, and which is sung in several Psalms. When Jehoram of Israel proceeded to subdue Moab again, Jehoshaphat made common cause with him. The Moabites were defeated, but the fortress, the Moabitish Kir, which lay on a lofty and steep chalk cliff, remained unsubdued. The interminable struggles with the Syrians rendered it impossible for the northern kingdom further to retain Moab, or generally the country east of the Jordan. In the time of Jehu the country east of the Jordan in all its breadth and length, as far down as the Arnon, was taken possession of by the Syrians (2 Kings x. 32, 33). The peoples that were now no longer subject to the kingdom of Israel rose again, oppressed the Israelitish population, and revenged on the weakened kingdom the loss of their independence. Jeroboam II., as Jonah the prophet had prophesied (2 Kings xiv. 25), was the first to re-conquer the territory of Israel from near Hamath to the Dead Sea. That he also again subdued Moab is indeed not expressly said, but as Moabitish bands in the time of his predecessor Joash disturbed even the country on this side the Jordan (2 Kings xiii. 20), it may be supposed that he also sought to keep Moab within bounds. If the Moabites had then, as was very probable, extended their territory beyond the Arnon to the north, war with Moab would have been absolutely inevitable. Further, in the time of Jeroboam II. on the one hand, and of Uzziah-Jotham on the other, we read nothing of risings of the Moabites; and statements like those in 1 Chron. v. 17 and 2 Chron. xxvi. 10 show that they kept themselves quiet. But the appeal to Assyria by Ahaz conjured up again the

[1] The Moabite stone has been reproduced with the most painstaking exactness, and translated in the best possible manner, in Smend-Socin's *Die Inschrift des Königs Mesa von Moab*, Heft i. 1888.

hostility of Moab and of the neighbouring peoples. Tiglath-pileser repeated in 754 B.C. what had been done by the Syrians; he took possession of the northern part of the country on this side the Jordan, and almost the whole of it on the other side, and depopulated it. The Moabites thereby found room for settling themselves again in their primeval dwelling-places to the north of the Arnon. This is how circumstances apparently stood at the time when Isaiah prophesied.[1] The misfortune comes from the north, and therefore strikes chiefly and primarily the region that lay to the north of the Arnon, which appears to be in the possession of the Moabites after having been previously peopled by the tribes of Reuben and Gad (1 Chron. v. 26).

There is no prophecy in the Book of Isaiah in which the heart of the prophet is so painfully moved by what his spirit beholds and his mouth must prophesy. All that he prophesies is felt as deeply by him as if he belonged to the poor people whose messenger of misfortune he is compelled to be. He begins at once with a feeling of dismay. Ver. 1: "*Oracle concerning Moab: for in a night is ʿAr-Moab devastated, destroyed; for in a night is Ḳir-Moab devastated, destroyed.*" The כִּי is both times expressive of a reason. The prophet justifies the superscription of his prophecy by the horrible vision which it is given him to see, transporting us at once into the heart of it as in chap. xvii. 1, xxiii. 1. עָר מוֹאָב (in which עָר is Moabitish for עִיר in Num. xxii. 36; cf. Jer. xlix. 3, where, instead of עָר which is expected, עַי is written) is the name of the capital of Moab, lying in the river valley of the Arnon (Deut. ii. 36; Josh. xiii. 9, 16). It is Grecised into *Ἀρεόπολις*, city of *Ἄρης* = כְּמוֹשׁ from כָּבַשׁ = כָּמַשׁ, in the present day a large field of ruins with a village of the name of Rabba. קִיר מוֹאָב (in which קִיר is Moabitish for קִרְיָה), the same as קִיר חֶרֶשׁ in chap. xvi. 11, Jer. xlviii. 31, 36, is the chief fortress of Moab, situated to the south-east of Ar, now called *Kerek*, still a city with a fortress on rocks, which is visible in clear weather with a telescope from Jerusalem, and which forms so completely one mass with the rock that Ibrahim Pasha in the year 1834

[1] See Wolf Wilh. Graf Baudissin, "Zur Erklärung des B. Jesaia Kap. 15 u. 16," in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1888, 509–521.

was compelled to give up his intention of demolishing it. The identity of Kir with Kerek (Targum דְמוֹאָב כְּרַכָּא) is indubitable, whereas the identity of ʿAr with Rabba has been disputed by Dietrich (in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 320 sqq.). For (1) the Old Testament and its versions do not mention any Moabitish Rabba; it is Eusebius who first mentions it; and it appears in consequence of the destruction of ʿAr by the earthquake, mentioned by Jerome in commenting on this passage, to have become the capital of the country, and to have obtained the name Ἀρεόπολις along with that of Rabbath Moab; (2) Ar lay on the Arnon boundary, whereas the ruins of Rabba are $6\frac{1}{4}$ hours' walk to the south of the Arnon, and do not lie on the northern boundary of Moab, but in its midst. The statement in Num. xxi. 15 makes it probable that Ar lay near the confluence of the *Legum* and *Mugib*, perhaps (at least the fortification that lay "on the heights of the Arnon," as mentioned in Num. xxi. 28) on the ruined site ام الرصاص (mother of lead), to the south-east of the confluence on the eastern mountain wall of the Arnon as it here winds southwards. The two names of the cities are used as masculine, like דמשׂק in chap. xvii. 1 and צֹר in chap. xxiii. 1, though it cannot be said here, as in Micah v. 1, that the city stands for the inhabitants. In a night it is all over with the two pillars of the might of Moab. בְּלֵיל might be taken as subordinating to itself what follows; in which case שֻׁדַּד would not be an infinitive (Baudissin), since such an inf. constr. Pual (except in Ps. cxxxii. 1) is without authority, but it would be 3 pret.: "in the night when,"—but where would the apodosis begin? Not with נִדְמָה (Ewald), for שֻׁדַּד and נִדְמָה almost coincide in meaning (cf. Jer. xlvii. 4, 5); nor with עָלָה (Hitzig), for the solemn anadiplosis is not favourable to the dependence of the two clauses on בְּלֵיל. We therefore take לֵיל absolutely, as in chap. xxi. 11, and the arrangement of the words is like that in Hos. x. 15 (Olsh. § 142*b*). In the space of a night, and therefore most suddenly (chap. xvii. 14), Moab is lost. As if fixed to the terrible spectacle, the prophet says twice over what is sufficiently said once (cf. on the asyndeton, chap. xxxiii. 9; and on the anadiplosis, ver. 8, chap. viii. 9, xxi. 11, xvii. 12, 13). His first feeling is that of horror.

But as horror, when it begins to reflect, is dissolved in tears, the thunder-claps in ver. 1 are now followed by universal weeping and lamenting. Vers. 2–4: "*They go up to the temple house, and Dibon unto the heights to weep; upon Nebo and upon Medeba, Moab wails; on all heads baldness, every beard mutilated. On Moab's markets they gird on sackcloth; on the country's roofs and in its streets everything wails, melting down into weeping. Heshbon cries and Elale, to Jahas they hear their howling,—wherefore even Moab's armed men break out in lamentations; his soul quakes in him.*" Seeking for help (לִבְכִּי, *ad fletum*), the people (the subject to עָלָה) ascend the mountain with the temple of Kemosh, the central sanctuary of the country. This temple is called הַבַּיִת, not (which is unexampled) some particular Moabite place, such as *Beth Diblathayim* in Jer. xlviii. 22 (as Knobel and Baudissin suppose), but rather the *Beth-Bamoth* mentioned in the inscription. *Dibon*, which lies, like all the places named in vers. 2–4, above the Arnon (Wadi Mugib), is now a heap of ruins situated a short hour's walk to the north of the middle Arnon in the magnificent plain of *el-Kurah*. It had heights for worship in the neighbourhood (cf. Josh. xiii. 17; Num. xxii. 41), and is therefore turned towards them. The style of ver. 2*a* is similar to that in chap. xliii. 14*b*. Moab laments on *Nebô* and *Mêdebâ*. יֵילִיל (for which יְהֵילִיל stands in chap. lii. 5), with a double preformative, is used intentionally for יֵילִיל (cf. similar forms in Job xxiv. 21 and Ps. cxxxviii. 6; Ges. § 70R). עַל is to be taken in a local sense, for Nebo was undoubtedly a place on a height of the mountain of that name, south-east from Heshbon (the ruined site of *Nabo, Nabau*, of the *Onom.*, now نِبَا); and Medeba (in Steph. Byz., according to Uranios, *πόλις τῶν Ναβαταίων*, now a ruined site with the same name) lay on a round hill about two hours to the south-east of Heshbon. According to Jerome, there was an image of Kemosh in Nebo; and among the ruins of Medeba, Seetzen recognised the foundation walls of a peculiar temple. There now follows the description of the expressions of pain. We read here רֹאשָׁיו with reference to what has become the standing collective phrase כָּל־רֹאשׁ (Amos viii. 10 and frequently elsewhere), instead of the otherwise usual רֵאשָׁיו. Instead of גְּדוּעָה, *abscissae*, Jeremiah, in chap. xlviii. 37, has גֹּרָעָה, *decurtatae;*

and the reading attested by the Masora on the passage is נִרוּעָה. Everything (כֻּלֹּה written as in chap. xvi. 7, whereas we have כֻּלּוֹ in chap. ix. 8, 16) runs down in weeping; elsewhere it is said of the eyes that they run down (יָרַד) in tears, waters, water-brooks, but here it is said still more boldly of the whole man that he flows down to the ground, running, as it were, into a stream of tears. *Heshbon* and *Elâle* are still visible in their ruins, situated on hills only half an hour's walk apart, and are known by the name of *Husbân* and *el-Al* (العال). Both places lay on heights commanding a wide view. There the cry of woe produced an echo that could be heard far and wide, even to *Jahaṣ* (*Jahsa*), the city where the king of Heshbon made a stand against Israel in the time of Moses (Deut. ii. 32). The general mourning is so great that even the equipped men of Moab (חֲלוּץ, *expeditus*, ready for striking, frequently used in the account of the seizure of the land east of the Jordan, Num. xxxii. 21, etc.; Deut. iii. 18), *i.e.* warriors (Jer. xlviii. 41), seized by the pain of despair, cried out (the same element in the figure as in chap. xxxiii. 7); עַל־כֵּן, thereat, that is to say, on account of this universal lamentation. The lamentation is therefore a universal one without exception, and נַפְשׁוֹ applies to Moab as a whole people. The soul of Moab quakes in all the members of the national body; יָרֵעָה (forming a play of sound with יְרִיעוּ) from יָרַע = רָעַשׁ, to quake, to waver, to flutter, from which comes יְרִיעָה, a fluttering tent curtain, and רִיעָה, reeds waving back and forward (see Fleischer in Levy's *Neu Hebr. WB.* ii. 446 sq.). Nägelsbach and others erroneously take יָרַע as a secondary verb to רָעַע, *imperf.* יֵרַע, to be pained. לוֹ, as in Ps. cxx. 6, cxxiii. 4, is an ethical dative throwing the action or the pathos inwards (as עָלָיו elsewhere). In this pain quivering through Moab the heart of the prophet shares; for, as Rashi observes, the prophets of Israel are distinguished from heathen prophets like Balaam in this, that the calamity which they announce to the Gentile peoples goes to their own hearts (compare chap. xxi. 34 with chap. xxii. 4).

The difficult words in which the prophet expresses this his sympathy in ver. 5*a* we translate thus: "*My heart towards*

Moab it cries out, its fugitives even to Zo'ar, the three-year-old heifer." The לְ in לְמוֹאָב, both here and in chap. xvi. 11, as in chap. xiv. 8, 9, means turned to Moab. מוֹאָב, which was masculine in ver. 4, is feminine here. From this it may be inferred that בְּרִיחָהּ עַד־צֹעַר is an expression concerning Moab as a land. Now, wherever בְּרִיחִים elsewhere occurs, it means the "bolts," according to which Jerome translates *vectes ejus usque ad Segor;* but everywhere else we read only of the bolts or bars of a city, as in Lam. ii. 9 and Jer. li. 30; cf. Jonah ii. 7. Hence I now prefer to follow the prevailing interpretation, according to which Zoar is named as the south point as far as which rolls the stream of the fugitives flying from the enemy pressing on from the north. Zoar lay (as the Excursus on Zoar by Wetzstein in the 4th ed. of my *Comm. on Genesis* shows) south-east from the Dead Sea in *·Gôr es-Sâfia;* the Safia is a wall of sandstone almost smooth, and about 1000 feet high, which is formed by the Moabite mountain range dipping down there perpendicularly to the *·Gôr*. עֶגְלַת שְׁלִשִׁיָּה is taken to be the name of a place by Graf (on Jer. xlviii. 34), Dietrich in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 342–346, and others, and signifying "Eglath the third." But (1) in favour of an appellative meaning is the fact that it stands in Jer. xlviii. 34 in like manner *ἀσυνδέτως*, after *Horonayim;* (2) here, in that case, what would be expected is שְׁלִשִׁית (הַשְּׁלִשִׁית); (3) there are indeed found names of places like أم قصير الثانية, "Um Kuseir the second," but a place with the surname of "the third" has not yet been shown to occur. We therefore hold by the view that עגלת שלישיה is in apposition either to צֹעַר or to מוֹאָב. In any case it is a distinguishing designation: a head of cattle of three years old, or literally, in its third year (cf. מִשְּׁלֶשֶׁת in Gen. xv. 9), *i.e.* a three-year-old beast (Ges. § 112, Rem. 1), which is still in full fresh strength, and not yet used up by prolonged bearing of the yoke. The reference of the term to the Moabitish people (LXX. Targum, Jer. Luther) is supported by reference to Jer. xlvi. 20, where Egypt in the same sense is called עֶגְלָה יְפֵה־פִיָּה; and Babylon is similarly designated in Jer. l. 11; cf. Hos. iv. 16, x. 11. But the reference to Zoar is more in accordance with the immediate suggestion of the syntax and the accentuation;

and it is supported by Jer. xlviii. 34, where, along with Zoar, Horonayim receives this surname. So then: Zoar the beautiful, strong, and hitherto unsubdued city, is now the goal of a wild flight before the enemy that is coming from the north. A blow so terrible as this has never struck Moab before.

In brief co-ordinated clauses the prophet brings before us the several scenes of mourning and desolation. Vers. 5*b*, 6: "*For the mountain slope of Luhith with weeping they ascend; for on the road to Horonayim they lift up a cry of despair, for the waters of Nimrim are deserts henceforth; for withered is the grass, the vegetation wastes away, gone is the green.*" The way to Luchith (according to the *Onom.*, lying between Ar-Moab and Zoar, and therefore in the centre of Moabitis proper) led up a height, and the road to Horonayim (according to Jer. xlviii. 5) led down a declivity. Weeping, they run to the mountain city to hide themselves there (בּוֹ, as in Ps. xxiv. 3, for which, in Jer. xlviii. 5, there is miswritten בְּכִי); raising a hue and cry, they stand before Horonayim, which lay below, and was more exposed to the enemy. יְעֹעֵרוּ (perhaps in order to be more an echo of the sound) has arisen from יְעָרְעוּ, like כּוֹכָב from כַּכָּבָּב, by a compensatory extension, just as כִּפָּר from כִּרְפָּר by compensative duplication. The LXX. renders the phrase well thus: *κραυγὴν συντριμμοῦ ἐξαναγεροῦσιν*, a peculiar expression which is foreign to us; it indicates a strained and always renewed outcry in view of a danger threatening utter destruction (שֶׁבֶר, as in chap. i. 28, xxx. 26), and its aim is to procure relief and help. The description is now transferred from the extreme south to the farthest north of the Moabite country, to as far as the Moabites had extended their territory; for Nimrim, as in fact identical with Beth-Nimra in Josh. xiii. 27 (Talmud, נמרין, and Peah iv. 5, בית נמר), lay, according to Wetzstein (*Comm. on Genesis*, pp. 572–574), three and a half hours' walk to the east of Jordan, still within the Peræan range on the Wadi Soeb, and more particularly on the south-east bank of the stream from whose abundance in water it is called נמרים. The waters there have been choked up by the enemy, and will now assuredly lie waste for ever (an expression similar to that in chap. xvii. 2). The enemy have been marching through the land, firing and burning, so that all its vegetation has in a manner disappeared. On these

miniature-like short sentences, compare chap. xxix. 20, xxxiii. 8, 9, xxxii. 10; and on לֹא הָיָה, it is not existing, or also it has become nothing, לֹא (like Assyrian *ul*), see Ezek. xxi. 32, 18; Job vi. 21; cf. Dan. iv. 32.

The Moabites then thus cross the border and flee to Idumea. The prophet gives the reason for this by continuing to link on further statements with כִּי. Vers. 7–9: "*Therefore what was saved, what was gained, and their store, they carry it over the willow-brook. For the cry of woe has gone the round in the territory of Moab; to Eglayim sounds Moab's wailing, and to Beer-Elim his wailing. For the waters of Dimon are full of blood; for I hang over Dimon new calamity, over the escaped of Moab a lion, and over the remnant of the land.*" יִתְרָה is the superfluity which goes beyond the immediate need, and פְּקֻדָּה (literally a laying up, *depositio*) what is carefully stored; עָשָׂה (in the same sense as Gen. xii. 5) is, as the borrowed passage in Jer. xlviii. 36 shows, an attributive clause (although the accentuation of our whole ver. 7 starts from another conception; see Rashi): what one has made, acquired, or gained. All these things they carry over נַחַל הָעֲרָבִים, which does not mean the desert brook (Hitzig, Maurer, Ewald, Knobel), as the plural of עֲרָבָה, desert, is עֲרָבוֹת; but it is either the Arab-brook (LXX. Saadia), or the willow-brook, *torrens salicum* (Vulg.). The last meaning is more suitable in itself; and among the streams flowing to the south of the Arnon from the mountains of the Moabitish highlands to the Dead Sea there is actually one which is called *Wâdi Ṣafṣâf, i.e.* willow-brook (as also we have the צַפְצָפָה, "willow"); it is the northern arm of the *Seil el-Kerek*. This may be considered to be what is meant here; but Wetzstein, on the contrary (on *Genesis*, pp. 567, 568), identifies the Arab-stream better with the *Zered* (זֶרֶד) = *Wâdi el-Aḥsâ* (*W. el-Ḥasâ*), the boundary river on the south, which separates Moab and Edom, and which in its eastern course bore this name. On emerging from the ravine of the high plateau, in the *Gôr*—in which the עֲרָב (*populus Euphratica*, see on chap. xliv. 4), which requires a very hot climate, is exclusively at home—it there has got the name נחל הערבים. Wading through this Arab-stream, they carry their possessions across, hurrying to the land of Edom; for their own land, in its whole extent,

has fallen a prey to the enemy, and within it the cry of lamentation goes from Eglayim on the south-west of Ar, and therefore not far from the south end of the Dead Sea (Ezek. xlvii. 10) as far as to (עַד to be supplied) Beer-Elim (Num. xxi. 16–18), in the north-east of the land towards the wilderness, and therefore—if a diagonal is drawn through it —from one end of the land to the other. Even the waters of *Dibon* (which here, in order to make it assonant with דָּם, is called דִּימוֹן), by which may be understood, as Hendewerk does, the Arnon lying less than an hour's walk therefrom (just as by מֵי מְגִדּוֹ, in Judg. v. 19, is meant the Kishon), are full of blood (מְלֵאוּ דָם); the enemy has therefore carried devastation and death to the heart of the country. But what drives them over the Arab-stream is not merely this; it is as if they foreboded that what has hitherto happened is not yet the utmost and last. Jehovah suspends שִׁית (as in Hos. vi. 11) over Dibon, whose waters are already reddened with blood, נוֹסָפוֹת, a something more coming, *i.e.* a still further judgment in punishment, namely, a lion. Moab's measure of misfortune is not yet full. After the northern enemy a lion will come upon those who have escaped by flight, and those who have been spared at home (compare on the expression, chaps. x. 20, xxxvii. 32). Reuss, who refers the prophecy to the second subjection of the land east of the Jordan under Jeroboam II., finds it consequently "difficult to say what the prophet means by the lion." This lion, however, is no other than the basilisk in the prophecy against Philistia, only with the difference that the basilisk is a definite Davidic king, whereas the lion is Judah generally, which had, according to Gen. xlix. 9, the lion as its emblem.

Just because Judah, with its sovereignty, is this lion, the summons now goes forth to the Moabites who fled to Edom, and particularly, as it appears, as far as סֶלַע, *i.e.* Petra (*Wâdi Mûsâ*), near Mount Hor, in Arabia Petrea, so called from it; and they are summoned to turn, seeking protection, to Jerusalem. Chap. xvi. 1: "*Send a land-lord's tribute of lambs out of the cliffs desertwards to the mountain of the daughter of Zion.*" This verse is like a long trumpet blast. The prophecy against Moab takes here the same turn as in chaps. xiv. 32, xviii. 7, xix. 16 sqq., xxiii. 18. The judgment produces

slavish fear, which then becomes refined into loving attachment. Submission under the house of David is Moab's only deliverance. This is what the prophet, weeping with those who weep, calls out to them to their hiding-corner, where they have concealed themselves in such long-breathed, hurried, and urgent words. Usually by סֶלַע is understood the *Selaʿ* of Edom (see on סֶלַע = Petra, Strabo, xvi. 4. 21); a citadel, سلع, was still standing in the Middle Ages in the *W. Mûsâ* of the Edomite mountains (الشراة; see Nöldeke in *DMZ.* xxv. 259, 260, and compare Blau, *DMZ.* xxvii. 324). However, Wetzstein (in the third German edition of this commentary, p. 698) is right in saying that all the attempts to explain how the Moabites come to be sending lambs out of the Petra of Edom are unsatisfactory,—the שלחו necessarily being taken as indicating voluntary obligation for the future,—and he understands by סלע the ravines of the מָעוֹן (*Maʿîn*) which run into the Dead Sea, and especially that of the Arnon, in which (now called الوكر, the rock recess) extensive recesses are formed by perpendicular walls, mostly several hundred fathoms in height. It is true that סלע does not mean ravine or cleft, but rather, in distinction from צור (mass of rock), the rock as cleft; and there is reason for following Barth[1] in explaining it, according to Jer. xlviii. 28, as: from the rock (the rocky region) where you have concealed yourselves. The tribute of lambs due to the prince of the country is briefly called כַּר מֹשֵׁל־אֶרֶץ; this tribute, which Mesha, the king of the pastoral country which was so rich in flocks (Num. xxxii. 4), formerly sent to Samaria (2 Kings iii. 4), they ought now to send to Jerusalem, to the "mountain of the daughter of Zion" (as in chap. x. 32, cf. chap. xviii. 7), to which the way which passes through the desert lying at the north end of the Dead Sea leads.

The counsel does not fail to make an impression; they embrace it eagerly. Ver. 2: "*And there, too, are found, like birds fluttering about, a scared nest, the daughters of Moab at the fords of the Arnon.*" בְּנוֹת מוֹאָב are like בְּנוֹת יְהוּדָה, *e.g.* in Ps. xlviii. 12, the inhabitants of the cities and villages of the land of Moab. They are, because fleeing from their country,

[1] *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Jesaia* (1885), pp. 20–23.

already themselves like wandering birds (Prov. xxvii. 8); but here, as תִּהְיֶינָה . . . וְהָיָה indicates, this comparison is used to depict the condition into which the advice of the prophet throws them. Both the figure (cf. chap. x. 14) and the expression (cf. chap. xvii. 2) are Isaianic. It is a state of anxious and timid irresoluteness, resembling the fluttering to and fro of birds that have been driven out of their nest, and that wheel anxiously around without venturing to return to the old dwelling-place. Thus do the daughters of Moab, coming out of their distant and near hiding-places, now show themselves at the fords of the Arnon. כַּעֲבָרוֹת לְאַרְנוֹן we should take as in apposition to בְּנוֹת מוֹאָב if מעברות signified coastlands (like עֲבָרֵי in chap. vii. 20), and not invariably fords; it is locative in meaning, and it is accentuated accordingly.

There — away at the point where their land formerly reached before it passed into the possession of Israel, on its utmost boundary, in the direction towards Judah, which was seated above it—they show themselves; and they take heart and send suppliant petitions over to Zion. The description is ideal. Vers. 3, 4*a*: "*Bring counsel, give decision, make thy shadow like night in the midst of noon; conceal outcasts, discover not wanderers! Let my outcasts tarry in thee! Moab —be a shelter to it from the devastator.*" In their perplexity, supplicating Zion for counsel, and submitting the decision of their fate to the men of Judah (so according to the *Kerî* [1]), they stand most fervently bespeaking Zion's shelter and protection — they who were formerly the proud Moabites, but are now completely humbled before Zion. Their anxiety after the dire distress of war, which has hardly yet been completely realized, is so great, that in the sunshine of noon they wish to be encompassed by Zion's protecting shadow as by black night, in order that the enemy may not be able to see them. To the anxious urgency of their supplicating request, correspond the short propositions in which they are expressed (cf. xxxiii. 8). פְּלִילָה (cf. פְּלִילִיָּה, chap. xxviii. 7) is the decision of a judge (פָּלִיל), the figure of the shadow is the same as in chaps. xxx. 2, 3, xxxii. 2, and elsewhere; נוֹדֵד is the same as

[1] So Kimchi, Ven. 1521, and Codd: הָבִיאוּ עֵצָה עֲשׂוּ פְלִילָה.

in chap. xxi. 14; נִדְחַי, the same as in chap. xi. 12; סֵתֶר is the same as in chap. xxxii. 2 and elsewhere; שׁוֹדֵד is the same as in chap. xxxiii. 1; כִּפְּנִי is the same as in chap. xxi. 15,—it is all word for word Isaianic. It is not necessary in ver. 4 to read נִדְחֵי for נִדְחַי מוֹאָב, and still less is *ay* a collective ending, as in chap. xx. 4. Nor does the expression: "My outcasts . . . of Moab," belong to the *syntaxis ornata* (cf. chap. xvii. 6); rather is such a mode of expression here, where the speaker is speaking of himself, utterly impossible. We keep to the existing interpunction, according to which נִדְחַי (*zakeph*) closes the first clause of ver. 4*a*, and מוֹאָב (*tebir*, which subordinates itself to the following *tipheha*, and with this to the *athnach*), not used as a vocative (Nägelsbach), but as a nominative, opens a nominal clause, so that the proposition is translated as above: "Moab—be a shelter to it" (without taking לְמוֹ = לוֹ).

The question now arises, by what means has Zion come to awaken such trustful respect and commanding reverence in Moab? The answer to this is given in vers. 4*b*, 5: "*For the extortioner has an end; desolation has disappeared; treaders under foot are away from the land. And a throne is established through grace; and there sits thereon in truth in the tent of David one who judges, and who is zealous for right, and who is skilled in righteousness.*" The imperial power which pressed out the marrow and blood (מִיץ in the form of לָץ, a pressor, like כִּיץ in Prov. xxx. 33, pressure), which devastated and trod down everything (chap. xxix. 20, x. 6, xxxiii. 1; cf. 8), is swept away from the land on this side of the Jordan, and Jerusalem has not fallen under it, but has come forth more glorious than ever out of her oppressions. The collective subject is here preceded by תַּמּוּ, as in Ps. xi. 7, Prov. xxviii. 1, cf. Job viii. 19, where the plural of the predicate follows. And the throne of the kingdom of Judah has not fallen, but by divine grace is anew established (הוּכַן, as in Zech. v. 11); there sits upon it no longer a king who disgraces it and endangers his kingdom; but the tent roof of the fallen, yet now again erected, tabernacle of David (Amos ix. 11) is arched over a king who makes truth the criterion of his action, while realizing right and justice by his government. מָהִיר designates one who masters a thing externally and spiritually with ease.

It is therefore the Messianic time which has dawned (according to which the Targum renders the passage; and Cheyne, Driver, and G. A. Smith agree with us in thus explaining it, while Baudissin historicizes it); for חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת and מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה are the divine-human insignia of this time, and as it were its kindred genii. And who could fail here to recall chap. ix. 6 (cf. chap. xxxiii. 5, 6)? If, but only if, Moab submits to the king on the re-established throne of David, will it escape the judgment.

But if Moab does this, and if the law of the history of Israel, which is שָׁאֹר יָשׁוּב, is then in this way reflected in Moab's history, ver. 6 cannot possibly be an answer going from Zion to Moab (Reuss, Baudissin, and others); but the prophecy begins here a new stage, starting from Moab's sin, and always more elegiacally describing Moab's penal fate. Ver. 6: "*We have heard of Moab's pride, the exceedingly overweening, his haughtiness, and his pride, and his indignation: the untruth of his sayings.*" With the future self-humiliation of Moab, which will be the fruit of its penal sufferings, is contrasted its previous self-exaltation, whose fruit these penal sufferings will be. שָׁמַעְנוּ, says the prophet, including himself along with his people (Cheyne). Boastful inflatedness was hitherto the distinguishing characteristic of Moab in relation to that people (see chap. xxv. 11). The accumulated words of the same verbal stem (cf. chap. iii. 1) are intended to express how very haughty (גֵּא from גֵּאָה, chap. ii. 12, the nominal form of the faults) their haughtiness, and how entirely possessed Moab was by it. Jeremiah in chap. xlviii. 29 retains this paronomasia as strengthening the meaning and exhausting the idea (cf. Prov. viii. 13; Job xl. 10; and above, on chap. iii. 1). Moab bragged, and was at the same time full of rage against Israel, to which, so far as it remained conscious of the truth of Jehovah, Moab's pratings (בַּדָּיו, from בָּדָא = בָּדַד, to think out something strange or new and to begin it; cf. *mentiri* = *mente fingere*) must appear as לֹא־כֵן, as not right, and contrary to the relation of things. The adjective or adverbial לֹא־כֵן of 2 Kings vii. 9 stands here substantively, like כֵּן in Prov. xi. 19. Such expressions of sentiment have been heard by God's people, and, as Jeremiah adds in chap. xlviii. 29, 30, also by Israel's God.

Therefore is the delightful wine-land mournfully laid waste. Vers. 6–8: "*Therefore will Moab wail for Moab, everything will wail: for the grape-cakes of Kîr Hareseth will ye whine, utterly crushed. For the fruit-fields of Heshbon have faded away, the vine of Sebma—lords of peoples its noble grapes smote down, they reached unto Ja'zer, twined through the desert; its branches spread themselves out wide, they crossed over the sea.*" The לְ in לְמוֹאָב is the same as in chap. xv. 5, and in the here following לַאֲשִׁישֵׁי. *Kîr-Haréseth* (in ver. 11 and in Jeremiah *Kîr-Héres;* cf. 2 Kings iii. 25, where the vocalization appears to be erroneous, חֶרֶשׂ or חֶרֶשׁ perhaps referring to glazed tiles or stones dressed for joining) is the chief fortress of Moab, which, according to chap. xv. 1, is destroyed, and therefore אֲשִׁישֵׁי appears to signify foundations, *i.e.* اسيس, اساس,[1] as laid bare or in ruins, like אֲשִׁיּוֹת in Jer. l. 15, and אֲשַׁיָּא in Ezra iv. 12 and elsewhere (synonymous with מוֹסְדֵי in chap. lviii. 12), with which Kimchi compares it. But the word, wherever it elsewhere occurs, means a kind of cake; and seeing that the devastation of the vineyards of Moab is what is further bewailed, it means here, as in Hos. iii. 1, grape-cakes, which consisted of grapes pressed together into the form of a cake (*DMZ.* iii. 366). Such cakes may have been a specially abundant article of the trade of Kir. Jeremiah has altered אֲשִׁישֵׁי into אֲנָשֵׁי in chap. xlviii. 31. הָנָה is to be understood according to chap. xxxviii. 14, lix. 11 (of the cooing of the dove); אַךְ is to be taken according to Deut. xvi. 15. On the construction of the plural form שְׁדֵמוֹת, compare Hab. iii. 17. שְׂרֵקִים, assuming that it is connected with שֹׂרֵקָה, שֹׂרֵק (chap. v. 2), means the beautiful red grapes of the noble vine which is named from them; for it is a colour word (Zech. i. 8). The clause with בַּעֲלֵי גוֹיִם has been translated by us with the same amphibole as it presents in the Hebrew; it may mean: lords of peoples or nations, *domini gentium*, smote down its vine-shoots, namely, those of the vine of שִׂבְמָה (with *gaya*, in order that the two labials

[1] The word in the Beduin is ساس, in diminutive سويس, *Suês*, the name of the well-known port, which designates it as having risen on the foundations of old harbour structures (*DMZ.* xxii. 175).

may be separated), הָלַם as in chap. xli. 7; or its vine-shoots smote down, *i.e.* intoxicated, the lords of nations,—*dominos gentium;* הלם being used as in the undisputed Isaianic prophecy in chap. xxviii. 1. As the prophet launches out here on the excellence of the wine of Moab, it is rather the latter that is meant. The wine of Sibma was so good that it came to the table of monarchs, and so strong that it smote down such drinkers as were accustomed to good kinds of wine, *i.e.* it irresistibly intoxicated them. This Sibma wine, as the prophet says, was cultivated far and wide in Moab: northwards unto Jazer (now a ruined site, صير), between Ramoth =Salt, and Heshbon,[1] eastwards into the desert, and southwards over יָם, *i.e.* (as in Ps. lxviii. 23 and 2 Chron. xx. 2) over the Dead Sea, which, being hyperbolical, is equivalent to till close to it. Jeremiah determines יָם more precisely in chap. xlviii. 32 as יָם יַעְזֵר, by which the hyperbole disappears. But what sort of sea is the sea of Jazer? Probably a celebrated large pool like the pools of Heshbon, a pool in which the water of the *Wâdi* (*Nahr*) *Ṣîr*, which rose close by, was gathered. Seetzen found some pools still existing there. That יָם is also used of large artificial basins of water, is shown by the יָם of Solomon's temple. In the present day in Damascus the marble basins of flowing water in the halls of the houses are still called *baḥarât;* and in like manner the public reservoirs in all the streets of the city, which are fed by an ancient network of aqueducts from the Barada river, are also thus designated.[2] The expression תעו מִדְבָּר is also a bold one; it probably points to the fact that there were trailing vines which did not require staking, but crept on the ground, and thus strayed into the desert, *i.e.* which extended into the pathless wilderness (תָּעוּ, *milel*, to favour the consonance with נִנְעוּ, cf. the milel forms כָּלוּ in Ps. xxxvii. 27; חָזוּ, Job xxiv. 1;

[1] The Targums render יעזר by מַכְוַר (מכבר), *i.e.* Machaerus, which is approved by Aug. Parent in his monograph, *Machaerous*, Paris 1868 (the fruit of a journey to the east of the Dead Sea); but this is an erroneous view. The ancient Machaeros, but not likewise the primeval Ja'zer, lay where Seetzen in Jan. 1807 found the ruined site مكور, *Makaur* (in the Attarus range of mountains on the south side of the *Zerḳa-Maîn*).

[2] Wetzstein, "Der Markt in Damaskus," in *DMZ.* 1857, pp. 476, 477.

עָרוּ עָרוּ, Ps. cxxxvii. 7; and the putting forward of the tone for the same purpose in פָּקֹד, chap. xxviii. 7).

The natural beauties and the fertility of the land which has fallen to a people are gifts out of the riches of divine goodness, remnants of the paradisiacal commencement of the history of man and types of its paradisiacal end, and for this reason they are not things without interest to the spirit of prophecy. Nor, for the same reason, is it unworthy of the prophet, who prophesies the renovation and perfecting of nature to paradisiacal beauty, to mourn elegiacally over such devastations as those of the wine-land of Moab now present before his mind (cf. xxxii. 12, 13). Ver. 9: "*Therefore I weep with Jazer's weeping for Sibma's vines; I flood thee with my tears, Heshbon and Elale, that upon thy fruit harvest and upon thy vintage hêdad has fallen.*" This is a tetrastich, in measure and movement resembling a Sapphic strophe. The prophet mingles his tears with Jazer's tears; as Jazer weeps for the devastated vines of Sibma, so does he also weep. אֲרַנֵּךְ is transposed out of אֲרַוֵּךְ = אַרְוֵךְ. Heshbon and Elale (see on this name *DMZ.* xxv. 560), these cities lying adjacent to each other with luxuriant fields שְׁדֵמוֹת (ver. 8), and which are now destroyed to the ground, are watered by the prophet with tears, because that הֵידָד has fallen upon the fruit harvest and wine harvest of both the sister cities. קָצִיר is elsewhere used for the wheat harvest, but it is here preferred to the more exact בָּצִיר for the sake of the alliteration with קַיִץ (cf. *e.g.* מסתור for סתר in chap. iv. 6). It is apparent from the figure indicated in הֵידָד that it is not the wheat harvest that is meant, but the vintage, which nearly coincided with the fruit harvest, which is called קַיִץ, as in chap. xxviii. 4. הֵידָד (from הָדַד, הדּ, to crack, to burst forth, after the form בֵּילָה and also הֵיכָל, هَيْكَل; cf. הֵילֵל, chap. xiv. 12) is not a battle-cry, like the Indo-Germanic ἀλαλά, but the self-regulating call at which the wine-pressers in the trough raise their legs and let them fall in order to squeeze the grapes (ver. 10; Jer. xxv. 30). Such a *hêdad* has fallen upon the rich plains of Heshbon-Elale, inasmuch as they have been pressed or trodden down by enemies,—

הֵידָד לֹא הֵידָד, a *hêdad* and yet no *hêdad*, as Jeremiah in chap. xlviii. 33 reproduces it in a beautiful oxymoron, *i.e.* there is no merry shout (Luther's *Song*) of proper grape-treaders.

The prophet, *i.e.* Isaiah, to whose favourite words and favourite figures כַּרְמֶל belongs as the name of a place and the name of a thing, now proceeds further in his description, and is plunged still deeper into mourning. Vers. 10, 11: "*And joy and jubilation is taken away from the garden land, and in the vineyards there is no rejoicing, no glad shouting; the grape-treader does not tread out wine in the troughs; to the hêdad I put an end—therefore my bowels sound for Moab like a harp, and my interior for Kir-Heres.*" Jehovah says הִשְׁבַּתִּי, and accordingly the words: therefore my bowels sound like a harp (or as Jeremiah expresses it in chap. xlviii. 36, like flutes), might also appear to be the expression of the feeling of Jehovah. Nor do the Scriptures actually shrink from attributing מֵעַיִם, *viscera*, to God, as *e.g.* in chap. lxiii. 15 and Jer. xxxi. 20. But as the prophet is the sympathizing subject throughout the whole prophecy, it is appropriate even on the ground of its unity to take the words here also as expressing his feelings. As the hand or plectrum moves the strings of the harp so that they vibrate with sound, so does the terrible thing which he presents Jehovah as saying concerning Moab move the strings of his inward parts, so that they sound in tones of deep pain. By the entrails are specially meant heart, liver, and kidneys—the noblest organs of the psyche—which, according to the Biblical idea, are the seat of the tenderest emotions, as it were the sounding-board of those "hidden sounds" to be found in every man. God converses with the prophet ἐν πνεύματι; but what occurs there takes form in the domain of the soul, in individual impressions in which the bodily organs of the psychical life sympathetically participate. Thus does the prophet in the spirit perceive God's purpose concerning Moab, in which he neither can nor would alter anything; but his soul is thrown by it into the restlessness of pain.

The ultimate reason of this restlessness is that Moab does not know the living God. Ver. 12: "*And it will come to pass; when Moab appears, wearies himself on the mountain height and enters into his sanctuary to pray—he will obtain nothing.*"

נִרְאָה נִלְאָה, a picturesque assonance such as Isaiah delights in. נִרְאָה (from it in chap. i. 12, לֵרָאוֹת, Talmud לירואות) is transferred from the Israelitish worship (the appearing before God in His temple, Talmud רָאִיוֹן, רָאִיָה, after the form רַעְיוֹן) to the heathen worship, syntactically: *si apparuerit*, with ו before the apodosis. It will go with the Moabites as with the priests of Baal in the time of Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 26 sqq.). Ewald supplies another apodosis: then will Moab give up his Kemosh and be converted to Jehovah. This thought would not be impossible before Jeremiah (Baudissin), but it remains unexpressed, and to interweave it (Cheyne) is unnecessary and unjustified.

The Massa is now at an end, and there follows an epilogue, which in conformity with the horizon of the history as moved forward assigns the term of the fulfilment of what is not now prophesied for the first time. Vers. 13, 14: "*This is the utterance which Jehovah uttered concerning Moab long ago. And now Jehovah speaks thus: In three years, as the years of a hired labourer, then is the glory of Moab dishonoured, together with all the multitude of the great, and a remnant miserably small, not great at all!*" The determination of the time is the same as in chap. xx. 3. Of the working time the hiring master remits nothing, and the hired labourer adds nothing to it. The statement of time is therefore to be taken exactly as three years and not longer, rather somewhat short of it than over it. Then will the old word of God concerning Moab be fulfilled. Only a remnant, a petty one, will remain (syntactically, as we have punctuated it, an exclamative clause); for all the history of the peoples is the shadow of the history of Israel.

The Massa, in chaps. xv. 1–xvi. 12, is therefore a word that had gone forth from God before, מֵאָז. This statement is capable of being taken in three different senses. (1) Isaiah may mean that older prophecies already announced the same thing in reference to Moab. But which? The answer to this may be derived from Jeremiah's prophecy concerning Moab in chap. xlviii. Jeremiah there reproduces the משא מואב of the Book of Isaiah, but interweaves with it reminiscences (*a*) from the Mashal concerning Moab in Num. xxi. 27–30; (*b*) from Balaam's prophecy concerning Moab in

Num. xxiv. 17 ; (*c*) from Amos's prophecy concerning Moab in Amos ii. 1–3 (see Caspari in *Luth. Zeitschrift,* 1843). Isaiah might mean these older words of prophecy, as Hävernick, Drechsler, and others hold. This, however, is very improbable, as there is no echo of these older pieces found in the Massa, which would be expected if Isaiah had them in mind. (2) Isaiah may mean that chap. xv. 1 sqq. is the prophecy of an older prophet which he only brings to remembrance in order to combine with it the term of its fulfilment as revealed to him. This is the view which prevails at present. Hitzig, in a special treatise on the subject (1831) and in his commentary, has endeavoured to make it probable on the ground of 2 Kings xiv. 25 that Jonah was the author of the oracle which is here taken up again by Isaiah. Knobel, Maurer, G. Baur, and Thenius agree with Hitzig ; de Wette, Ewald, Umbreit, Reuss, and Kuenen regard it at least as borrowed from an older prophet by Isaiah from the terms of his postscript ; and Cheyne assigns the author to the beginning of the reign of Uzziah. It is hardly possible to think of Jonah as the author. Jonah belongs to the prophets of the type of Elijah and Elisha, in whom the eloquence of prophetic address still falls entirely behind the energy of the prophetic act. His prophecy of the bringing back of the kingdom of Israel to its ancient extent, fulfilled by the victories of Jeroboam II., is not to be thought of as so picturesque and so highly poetic as the משא מואב is, which would only be a part of that prophecy. And, moreover, that Jonah went into the sulks about the sparing of Nineveh, also accords badly with the elegiac softness of this prophecy and its flood of tears. Nor is it anywhere indicated that the conquerors to whom Moab succumbs are of the kingdom of Israel ; and the hypothesis completely breaks down upon the call addressed to Moab to send tribute to Jerusalem. My young friend Oscar Vallette, who died in Paris on the 17th April 1883, after a richly blessed activity in the ministry, in a *Thèse* of the year 1864, ably brought together the reasons against this view. But the fact that the oracle must be derived from some other older prophet is an inference from grounds which are worthy of consideration, but are not sufficient to establish it. It is acknowledged that not only

the epilogue but also chap. xvi. 5*b*, 6 included in the Massa, are thoroughly Isaianic. If the view of Cheyne is not adopted, who regards chap. xvi. 5*b*, 6 as an expansion of the older original Massa by Isaiah, then there undoubtedly predominates in the rest of it expressions which are not discoverable elsewhere in Isaiah; yet they are not on that account un-Isaianic. The expressions which are not found elsewhere in Isaiah are בַּעֲלֵי גוֹיִם, הֵידַד, יֶלֶל, יָרַע, יִתְרָה, כָּהִיר, כִּין, נוֹסָפוֹת, פְּקֻדָּה (provision, possession). There is something peculiar in the circular movement of the discourse in the relation of reason and consequence carried out, as it is, to such length, and in the monotonous combination of clauses by כִּי and עַל־כֵּן (לָכֵן), of which the former is repeated twice in chap. xv. 1, thrice in chap. xv. 8, 9, and even four times in succession in chap. xv. 5, 6. But, in fact, there is no Isaianic prophecy which does not contain expressions exclusively used in it by the prophet; and as regards the conjunctions כִּי and עַל־כֵּן (לָכֵן), Isaiah accumulates them also elsewhere, but here it is done even till it becomes monotonous as a natural consequence of the elegiac mood which prevails throughout. And is not chap. xv. 6*b* in form just like chap. xvi. 4*b*? And if it is true that in Isaiah there is not found elsewhere a prophecy which is elegiac through and through, yet is not chap. xxii. 4 an approach to the *kîna*? The third possible view will therefore be the real one. (3) Isaiah intends to say that the fate of Moab just proclaimed was already long since revealed to himself, but now in addition to this it was revealed that it will be realized in exactly three years. מֵאָז does not necessarily point to a time before Isaiah (compare chap. xliv. 8, xlviii. 3, 5, 7, with 2 Sam. xv. 34). If we assume that what Isaiah prophesies down to chap. xvi. 12 was already revealed to him in the death-year of Ahaz (at all events after Tiglath-pileser's invasion of the country east of the Jordan, in consequence of which, according to the evidence of inscriptions, the king of Moab became a tributary vassal), and that the epilogue is to be reckoned from the third or the tenth year of Hezekiah, in either case the interval is long enough for the מֵאָז. We indeed do not know anything certain about the time at which the three years up to the fulfilment commences. The question whether Shalmanassar, or Sargon,

or Sennacherib is to be thought of as the king who treated the Moabites so hardly, cannot be answered. In Herodotus (ii. 141), Sennacherib is called *βασιλεὺς Ἀραβίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίων*. Moab might be included in the Arabians (*Ἀραβίων*). In any case there remained of Isaiah's prophecy, when it had been fulfilled in the Assyrian time, a further part or surplus whose fulfilment, according to Jer. xlviii., was reserved for the Chaldeans.

The Oracle concerning Damascus and Israel, Chap. XVII.

From Philistia, the neighbouring people on the west, and Moab, the neighbouring people on the east, the prophecy now proceeds northwards to the people of the Damascene-Syria. The curse pronounced upon it falls also upon the kingdom of Israel, because it has allied itself with the heathen Damascus against their brethren in the south and the Davidic kingdom, and by this unnatural alliance with a עָרִי has itself become a עָרִי. From the reign of Hezekiah, to which the מַשָּׂא מוֹאָב belongs, according to its epilogue at least, we are here carried back to the reign of Ahaz, and indeed back far beyond the death-year of Ahaz (chap. xiv. 28) to the boundary line of the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, soon after the conclusion of the league which aimed at Judah's destruction, by which revenge was taken for the similar league of Asa with Benhadad against Israel (1 Kings xv. 9). When Isaiah incorporated this oracle in his collection, its threats against the kingdoms of Damascus and Israel had long been fulfilled. Assyria had punished both of them, and Assyria had also been punished, as the fourth strophe of the oracle sets forth. The oracle therefore stands here on account of its universal contents, which are instructive for all time.

The first strophe. Vers. 1–3: "*Behold, Damascus must away out of the number of cities, and becomes a heap of fallen ruins. Forsaken are the cities of Aroer; to flocks they are given up, which lie down there without any one scaring them away. And abolished is fortress from Ephraim, and kingdom from Damascus: and to those left of Aram it happens as to the glory*

of the sons of Israel, saith Jehovah of Hosts."[1] הִנֵּה, with the following participle, points, as it does everywhere else, to what is just about to happen. Damascus is removed מֵעִיר (=מֵהֱיוֹת עִיר, cf. 1 Kings xv. 13), out of the sphere of existence as a city. It becomes, in fact, מְעִי כַּפֵּלָה, a heap of fallen ruins. The word-form מְעִי (=מעוה, *maʿawî*), of which no instance elsewhere occurs, is deleted by de Legarde as "dittography;" but the striving after word-painting in tones produces strange forms, and so here מְעִי appears as if it would be an echo to מֵעִיר, of which it is an apocope: Damascus becomes the fragment of a city. The same thing happens to Israel, which has made itself an appanage of Damascus. The cities of Aroer (*gen. appos.* Ges. § 114. 3) represent the land to the east of the Jordan in which the judgment on Israel, executed by Tiglath-pileser, began. There were, in fact, two Aroers: an old Amorite Aroer, which fell to the tribe of Reuben, situated on the Arnon (Deut. ii. 36, iii. 12, and elsewhere); and an old Ammonite Aroer, which fell to the tribe of Gad—Aroer before Rabba (Rabbath Ammon, Josh. xiii. 25). The site of the ruins of the former is عراعر, *ʿArâir*, on the high northern bank of the *Mûjib;* the situation of the latter has not yet been ascertained with certainty (see Keil on Josh. xiii. 25). The "cities of Aroer" are these two Aroers along with the cities on the east of Jordan like them, just as the "Orions" in chap. xiii. 10 are Orion and stars like it. We again find here in עָרֵי עֲרֹעֵר a significant play of sound: the name of Aroer is ominous. It will happen to the cities of its circuit as its name indicates; עָרַר signifies to lay bare, to tear down (Jer. li. 58), and עָרְעָר (עֲרִירִי) signifies being in a stark-naked state, in desolation and solitude (عرعر, *juniperus*, and as its *plur. fractus*, ערוער, the name of the place may be explained as "juniper bushes," as is done by de Lagarde). Job xi. 19 (cf. Zeph. iii. 13) is the original passage on which chap. xvii. 2*b* *β* is founded. After ver. 1 has threatened

[1] Before ver. 3 there is found in the Codd. the remark: חצי הנביאים בפסוקים, also *Bibl. rabbin.:* חצי הנביאים. The Masora reckons from Joshua to Isa. xvii. 3 the number of verses to be 4647, the half of the 9294 verses of all the *Nebîim.*

Damascus in particular, and ver. 2 has threatened Israel in particular, ver. 3 takes them both together. Ephraim loses the strong cities which served it as protecting walls, and Damascus loses the rank of a kingdom. Those of Aram who remain and who do not fall in the war, become like the proud citizens of the kingdom of Israel—they are dragged away captive. All this was fulfilled by Tiglath-pileser. The accentuation draws שְׁאָר אֲרָם to the first half of the verse; but the meaning remains the same, as the subject to יִהְיוּ is in any case the Aramaeans.

Second strophe. Vers. 4–8: "*And it comes to pass in that day, then the glory of Jacob wastes away, and the fat of his flesh becomes lean; and it will be as when a reaper grasps the stalks of corn, and his arm mows off the ears; and it will be as with one who gathers ears in the valley of Rephaim. Yet a gleaning remains thereof, as at the olive beating: two, three berries above at the top; four, five in its, the fruit tree's, branches, saith Jehovah, the God of Israel. In that day man will glance up to his Creator, and his eyes will look to the Holy One of Israel. And he will not glance round to the altars, the product of his hands, and what his fingers have made he will not regard, neither the Astartes nor the Sun-gods.*" This strophe does not speak of Damascus, but only of Israel, and, moreover, of all Israel, the range of vision widening out from Israel in the narrower sense to this total view. It will diminish to a small remnant, but this will return. שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב is thus the law of the history of Israel, which is here applied first on its threatening side, and then on its promising side. The reputation and prosperity to which the two kingdoms were raised by Jeroboam II. and Uzziah will pass away. Israel is ripe for judgment, like a field of corn in the ear for the harvest; and it will therefore be as when a reaper grasps the upright stalks and cuts off the ears. קָצִיר is not used elliptically for אִישׁ קָצִיר (Gesenius), nor is it a determination of time (Luzzatto, Nägelsbach), nor the accusative of the object (Knobel), but an intensive active noun in the sense of a reaper, formed like נָבִיא, פָּלִיל, פָּרִיץ (otherwise קֹצֵר, Arab. قصّال from قصل = קצר). The figure here indicated is expanded in John iv. and Rev. xiv. There will hardly any one escape

the judgment, just as in the wide plain of Rephaim, covered with precious wheat fields, sloping down from Jerusalem towards the south-west to Bethlehem, the reapers scarcely leave an ear lying here or there. Nevertheless a gleaning is left over of Israel (בּוֹ, *i.e.* יַעֲקֹב, ver. 4, chap. x. 22); just as when the branches of the olive tree, which have been already plucked by the hand, are again further shaken with a stick (כְּנָקֹף, like a shaking off = just as with . . . Ges. § 118. 3 Rem.), there still remain a few berries hanging on the highest branch (two, three, cf. 2 Kings ix. 32), or hidden under the foliage of the branches. "Its, the fruit-tree's, branches" (סְעִפֶיהָ, not סְעִפִיה) is an elegant expression, as *e.g.* Prov. xii. 4, xiv. 13; the drawing over of the ה to the second word is natural in both passages, but the same mode of expression is also found where this removal is impracticable, as in 2 Sam. xxii. 33; Ps. lxxi. 7 (see comm. on the passage); cf. chap. xvi. 4*a*. This small remnant will turn with undiverted look to the living God, as is becoming in man as such (הָאָדָם), and not consider the idols worth a look, least of all a devout look: neither the חמנים nor the אשרים, the two ו being correlative. חַמָּנִים are here images of the sun-god, בעל חמן, well known from the Phoenician monuments (see 2 Chron. xxxiv. 4),[1] as in Himyaritic שמיטהו, his sun is used for his sun-sanctuary; and so אֲשֵׁרִים (for which we find more rarely אֲשֵׁרוֹת) may be images of the אֲשֵׁרָה, and this may be a name of Astarte; a view supported by 2 Kings xxiii. 4, "Baal, Ashera, and the whole host of heaven," and 1 Kings xv. 13, מפלצת לַאֲשֵׁרָה אֲשֵׁרָה has now actually been shown to be a name of Astarte in the form *Ašratu*.[2] The name signifies the blessed, the saving (salvation-bringing), holy one. Of the same root are the Assyrian plurals *ašrê* (from *ašru*) and *ašrâti* (from *aširtu*), which mean places of grace (temples).[3] The proper name of the goddess is *Ištâr*, or corresponding to the Hebrew עַשְׁתֹּרֶת,

[1] Sanchuniathon professes to have drawn his information from *ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμουνέων γράμματα*. Ἀμμούνεα are pillars or temples of the בעל חמן. The *Gr. Venetus* translates חמנים, Lev. xxvi. 30, with reference to *ἄκαμας ἡέλιος*, ingeniously by the similar sounding *ἀκάμαντες*.

[2] By the Phoenicio-Assyrian *Abd-Ashera*-table of Tell-el-Amarna, see Schrader in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Bd. iii. 363, 364.

[3] See on this, Friedrich Delitzsch, in his Excursus on the name of Tiglath-pileser, in Baer's edition of the *Liber Chronicorum*, 1888.

Ištârtu.[1] אֲשֵׁרִים (אֲשֵׁרוֹת) is the name applied to her consecrated places, particularly pleasure groves (*bosquets*) or trees (Deut. xvi. 21; cf. the verbs נדע, כרת, נחשׁ, used of removing them); but here probably her statues or images (2 Kings xxi. 7; compare the כִּפֻּלְצֶת in 1 Kings xv. 13, which is meant to apply to an obscene representation). For these images of the sun-god and of the goddess of the moon or morning star the remnant of Israel purified by the furnace of judgment has no longer an eye. Their look is exclusively directed to the one true God of mankind. The promise, which begins to dawn at the close of the second strophe, is now again swallowed up in the third strophe, only to break forth again in the fourth with double and triple intensity.

Third strophe. Vers. 9–11: "*In that day will his fortified cities be like the ruins of the forest and of the mountain-top, which they evacuated before the sons of Israel: and there arises a waste. For thou hast forgotten the God of thy salvation, and of the rock of thy fortress thou hast not thought, therefore didst thou plant pleasant plantations, and didst set them with strange vine slips. In the day that thou plantedst, thou didst draw a hedge, and with the morning dawn thou broughtest thy seed to the blossom,—a harvest heap in the day of deep wounds and deadly pain.*" What was said in ver. 3, that the fortress of Ephraim is abolished, is repeated in ver. 9 in a more descriptive way. To the strongly fortified cities of Ephraim it happens as to the old Canaanite forts which were still visible in their antiquated remains in the depths of woods or on the heights of mountains. The word עֲזוּבָה, which was not understood by the old interpreters, means, as in chap. vi. 12, desolate places that have become ruined. Instead of הַחֹרֶשׁ וְהָאָמִיר, the LXX. read החוי והאמרי (which is approved by de Lagarde), but in the translation they transpose the two names thus, *οἱ Ἀμορῥαῖοι καὶ οἱ Εὐαῖοι.* הָאָמִיר undoubtedly means elsewhere the top of a tree, which is not suitable here; but as in this sense it goes back to אָמַר, *extollere efferre* (see on Ps. xciv. 4), the Hiphil of which in the Mishna (*Sota*

[1] Schlottmann, in *DMZ.* xxiv. 658 sqq., derives the name, starting from the Deuteronomic עִשְׁתְּרוֹת הצאן, Deut. vii. 13 *et al.*, from עשׁר, to connect, to beget. Fried. Delitzsch also regards *Ištârtû* as a triliterate with inserted ת (*Assyr. Gramm.* § 65, No. 40).

ix. 14) means "to top" (היוקר יאמיר, the dearness will reach its highest degree), it may also mean the top of a mountain, as the contrast to the base of a mountain (Job xxviii. 9), and therefore the summit of the mountain.[1] The name of the people, הָאֱמֹרִי (signifying those who dwell high up in the mountains), proves the possibility that the prophet had this name in his mind, and was determined by it in his choice of the word. It is not necessary to read עָזְבוּ for עֻזְּבוּ; the subject of עֻזְּבוּ is evident of itself. It is only ruins in woods and mountains that are mentioned, because other places lying on the lines of intercourse merely changed inhabitants when the Israelites took possession of their country. The reason that the same fate is to overtake Ephraim's strong forts as fell on those of the Amorites then lying in ruins, was because, as is said in ver. 10, Ephraim had turned away from his true rock-fast fortress, his stronghold of Jehovah. It is a consequence of this estrangement from God that Ephraim planted נִטְעֵי נְעֲמָנִים (תִּטְעִי, with *Dag. compensativum*, and not the ambiguous תִּטָּעִי), plantations of lovely kind of things = lovely plantations (as in Sur. 56. 90, *ǵennâtu naʿîmin*, see on Ps. lxxviii. 49), *i.e.* they made for themselves all kinds of sensuous cults in conformity with their heathen inclination. Perhaps נעמנים points to a particular cult, such as that of Adonis.[2] And further, it is a consequence of this estrangement from God that Ephraim planted these garden grounds (to which the suffix *ennu* belongs) with strange vines; or since זְמֹרָה signifies the setter of the vine, he has set it with them, that is to say, by concluding an alliance with a זָר, the king of Damascus. On the very day of the planting Ephraim carefully fenced it in (this is what the *Pilpel* שִׂגְשֵׂג from סוּג = שׂוּג signifies, not: to bring up, as שָׂגָא = שׂוּג, סָגָא, cannot be established); that is to say, he insured the continuance of those sensuous cults in the manner of a State-religion with the prudence of a Jeroboam (see Amos vii. 13), and what had been sown was already brought into blossom in the morning.

[1] Cognate is أَعْمَرَة, which means a heap of stone, a way-mark (sign-post), and also a hill.

[2] De Lagarde, with whom Cheyne agrees, combines נעמן as an Adonis-name (cf. Ewald, § 287*a*) with the name of the Anemone.

The foreign slip has shot up like a hothouse plant, *i.e.* the alliance has rapidly become a happy agreement, and has also already shot forth a blossom which is the common plan directed against Judah. But this planting, which has been so flattering and so full of promise for Ephraim, and which flourished rapidly and seemingly so happily, is a harvest heap for the day of judgment. The modern expositors almost all take נֵד (for which LXX. have ער, and Syr. ניר = yoke), according to the Targum and Jer., as the 3rd person, according to the form מֵת: the harvest flees; but the 3rd pers. of נוּד must be נָד, like the part. in Gen. iv. 12; whereas the meaning *cumulus*, which it has elsewhere as a substantive, is quite appropriate, and the statement of the prophet is like that of the apostle in Rom. ii. 5. The day of the judgment is called day of נַחֲלָה (נְחָלָה), in no case = נַחַל, river, stream (Luzzatto: *in giorno di fiumana*), as in Ps. cxxiv. 4, the accent being on the last syllable is opposed to this; nor is it on the day of the possession (Rosenmüller, Meier, Drechsler, and others, following LXX. and Jer.), which, as expressing nothing of itself, would require more precise definition; but it is the feminine of נַחֲלָה, and written shortly for מַכָּה נַחֲלָה in Jer. xiv. 17, x. 19, Nah. iii. 19, inasmuch as it inflicts grievous and deadly wounds. On this day Ephraim's plantation becomes manifest as a harvest heap. What he has heaped up is in that day brought home (cf. קָצִיר, a harvest of punishment, Hos. vi. 11; Jer. li. 33), and the hope set upon this plantation is changed into כְּאֵב אָנוּשׁ, a despairing, incurable heart-sorrow (Jer. xxx. 15). The organic connection of what now follows in vers. 12–14 with the oracle concerning Damascus-Israel has been either entirely misunderstood on the one hand or not properly appreciated on the other. The relation is this: As the prophet sets before himself how Ephraim's sin is punished by Assyria, and how the latter sweeps over the Holy Land, the promise which appears in the second strophe now breaks fully through: the world-power is Jehovah's instrument of punishment, but not for ever.

Fourth strophe. Vers. 12–14: "*Woe to the roaring of many peoples; like roaring of seas they roar, and to the rumbling of nations like the rumbling of mighty waters they*

rumble. Nations like the rumbling of many waters they rumble and He threatens it—then it flies far away, and is chased like chaff of mountains before the wind, and like straw haulms before the whirlwind. At eventide—behold, there is consternation; even before morning dawn it is annihilated—this is the portion of our plunderers and the lot of our robbers." It is the annihilation of Assyria which the prophet prophesies here, as in chaps. xiv. 24–27, xxix. 5–8, and elsewhere; but not of Assyria as Assyria, but of Assyria as the empire, which embraces a multitude of peoples (chaps. xxii. 6, viii. 9, 10, xiv. 26, xxix. 7, 8) under one will for a common combating of the Church of God. The relation of this fourth strophe to the third is entirely like the relation of chap. viii. 9, 10 to chap. viii. 6–8. The exclamation of woe, הוֹי, is, as in chap. x. 1, an expression of the pain of wrath, which is then followed by the proclamation of the judgment of wrath. The description of the billow of peoples is as picturesque as the well-known description: *ille inter sese*, etc., of the Cyclopes in Virgil. "It spreads and stretches out; it is as if it would not cease to swell, and to roar, and to surge, and to sound" (Drechsler). In בּוֹ, in ver. 13*a*, the many surging peoples are kneaded together as into one mass. The onomatopoeic word גער (in Ethiopic, to cry, to lament) signifies a commanding influence bringing about silence and yielding. It costs God only one threatening word, and then this mass flees far away (מִמֶּרְחָק, like מֶרְחוֹק in chap. xxii. 3; see on chap. v. 26); it is scattered and whirled asunder like chaff from high-lying threshing-floors, and as גַּלְגַּל before the storm. The Chaldee גִּלְגְּלָא (גֻּלְגַּל) and Arabic *ǵill*, *ǧull*, *ǵall*, demonstrate the meaning of גלגל to be: stubble, dry blades of straw, √ גל, to be round, and to roll, to move easily and quickly. The judgment begins to execute overthrow בַּעֵת עֶרֶב (from בָּלַהּ, בָּלַע, to get out of control, to be out of oneself) in the evening. It rages in the night, and before the break of the morning the host of peoples belonging to the imperial power is annihilated (compare chap. xxix. 9, 10, and the fulfilment in chap. xxxvii. 36). The fact that this particular oracle concerning Damascus is so comprehensive on this fourth stage, and is so promising for Israel, is explained on the ground that Syria was the

precursor of Assyria in the attack on Israel, and that the alliance of Israel with Syria had become the cause of the complications with Assyria. If the matter of the מַשָּׂא דַּמֶּשֶׂק had been restricted to what the name Mahershalal expresses, then the element of promise which is characteristic of the prophecies against the peoples of the world (the Gentile nations) would be entirely lacking in it. But the shout of triumph, וֶה חֶלֶק וגו׳, supplied a terminal point which the מַשָּׂא cannot pass beyond unless it is to sacrifice its unity. We are therefore justified in taking chap. xviii. as a prophecy by itself, although at the same time this last strophe of the oracle concerning Damascus forms the ring linking into which the following prophecy concerning Ethiopia is immediately attached.

Ethiopia's Submission under Jehovah, Chap. XVIII.

The view which holds that chap. xviii. 4–6 contains a description of the judgment inflicted on Ethiopia by Jehovah is untenable. The prophet prophesies the annihilation of the army of Sennacherib in his usual way, and as it was fulfilled in chap. xxxvii. 36. Equally untenable, however, is the old Jewish and Christian view, which has been taken up again by Hofmann, that the people so strangely described at the beginning and close of the prophecy is the people of Israel. The borrowed passage in Zeph. iii. 10 should not mislead us, for it fuses together references to Isa. xviii. and lxvi. The people here peculiarly described are the Ethiopians, and the prophet prophesies the effect on Ethiopia of the judgment concerning Assyria which Jehovah executes, as Drechsler has convincingly proved (*Studien u. Krit.* 1847, and *Komm.*), and as is now universally recognised. But it is not probable either that the prophecy falls later than the Assyrian expedition against Egypt (Schegg), or that the Ethiopian ambassadors whom it mentions are dispatched to Judah to offer it friendship and help (Ewald, Knobel, Meier, and Thenius). No; the expedition against Egypt, including Ethiopia, is only in prospect, and that against Judah is a means to this end. And the ambassadors do not go to Judah, but, as Drechsler apprehends the situation, with the most active despatch they

carry commands to all the regions under Ethiopian rule. The Ethiopian kingdom is, in view of the impending Assyrian invasion, in the greatest excitement, and the envoys are sent forth to call out the available military force. From the fact that in the trilogy contained in chaps. xviii.–xx., Ethiopia and Egypt are specially treated, and are carefully kept apart in chap. xx., it appears that we must conclude that at the time when the prophecies in chaps. xviii., xix. went forth, and in the time of Sargon, Egypt and Ethiopia were not yet one kingdom. Moreover, Sennacherib, in the prism-inscription (translated in Friedr. Delitzsch's *Assyr. Lesestücken*, xii.–xvi.), still distinguishes kings of Egypt (*šarrâni*[1] *mâtu Muṣuri*) and a king of Ethiopia (*šar mâtu Meluhhi*), whom he boasts of having defeated near Eltekê (אֶלְתְּקֵה, Josh. xix. 44). Egypt and Ethiopia did not actually become a single kingdom till the time of Psammetichus the son of Necho, whose son, Necho II., on his march against Nabopolassar encountered Josiah. In the Delta, the two chief dynasties, the Saitic and the Tanitic, still contended with each other; but in Thebes the Ethiopian supremacy always gained more in power, and the kings of the Delta were not able to make a stand against it. *Shebek* (*Σαβάκων*) the סוא (סֵוֵא), on whom Hosea, the last king of the northern kingdom, depended (2 Kings xvii. 4), was the beginner of the new (25th) dynasty, consisting of Ethiopian kings, which, from 725 B.C., reduced the lesser kings to vassals. It was he whom Sargon overthrew at Raphia in 720 B.C. His successor was *Shabatok*, whom *Taharḳa*, who encountered Sennacherib's expedition against Judah, removed out of the way in 672 B.C.; and Taharka himself was subdued by Esarhaddon in 672 B.C., and this was the end of the Ethiopian dynasty. At this time, then, when the prophecies in chaps. xviii., xix., xx. were given forth, Egypt was not yet a single kingdom. The local princes of Lower Egypt were not yet removed; the Ethiopian dynasty had the supremacy, but only in so far as it asserted itself by force and craft. The separating of Egypt and Ethiopia in Isaiah is founded on the same political ground

[1] Of the texts of the two copies of the prism-inscription one has *sarrâni*, and the other *sar*. On the place of the battle of Eltekê, in the order of the details of the Jewish campaign, see Friedrich Delitzsch's art. "Sanherib" in the *Herzog-Hauck RE.* xiii.

as that of the kings of Egypt and of the king of Meluḫḫi in the prism-inscription of Sennacherib. Moreover, it cannot be exactly determined how near or far from the time when the Assyrian army entered on the expedition through Judah to Egypt the prophecy in chap. xviii. was composed. What it sets forth in prospect, namely, that the judgment of Jehovah upon the empire will have as its consequence the submission of Ethiopia to Jehovah, did occur at least in a preliminary way after the catastrophe of Assyria (2 Chron. xxxii. 23).

The prophecy begins with הוֹי, which never means *heus*, but always *vae*. Here, however, it differs from chap. xvii. 12 in being rather an expression of compassion (cf. Isa. lv. 1; Zech. ii. 10) than of anger; for the fact that the more mighty Assyria is coming against the mighty Ethiopia, is a humiliation prepared for the latter by Jehovah. Vers. 1, 2*a*: "*Woe, land of the whirring of wings, which is beyond the rivers of Kûš, which sends messengers to sea, and in papyrus boats over the face of the waters.*" The land of Kush begins, according to Ex. xxix. 10, cf. xxx. 6, where Upper Egypt ends. The סְוֵנֵה (*Aswân*) mentioned by Ezekiel is the boundary point where the Nile enters מִצְרַיִם proper, and which is still in the present day a depot of the products that come by the Nile from the south. The נַהֲרֵי־כוּשׁ, which are to be sought to the south of that point, are chiefly those that flow round the Kushite כְּבָא (Gen. x. 7). This latter name is applied to the insular or interfluvial land of Meroë which is enclosed by the White and Blue Nile (the *Astapos* of Ptolemy, now *Baḥr el-Abyaḍ*, and the *Astaboras* of Ptolemy, now *Baḥr el-Azraḳ*), the present *Sennâr*, which, as such, is called الجزيرة (like Mesopotamia). Besides, the multitude of tributaries which in its long course bring always new masses of water to the Nile, might be well known generally to the prophet. The land "beyond the rivers of Kush" is the land bounded by the upper streams of the Nile, *i.e.* the land lying farther to the south under the Ethiopian rule, including Ethiopia proper; it is the land of its African auxiliaries, whose names (including probably the later Nubians and Abyssinians) are mentioned in 2 Chron. xii. 3; Nah. iii. 9; Ezek. xxx. 5; Jer. xlvi. 9. To this Ethiopia, designated according to its farthest limits (cf. Zeph. iii. 10), the prophet gives the peculiar name אֶרֶץ

צִלְצַל כְּנָפַיִם. This has been explained as the land of the wings of an army with clanging arms (Gesenius and others); but כְּנָפַיִם has not, even in chap. viii. 8, immediately the same sense as אֲגַפִּים in Ezekiel. Or, again, it is explained as "land of the noise of waves" (Umbreit); but כְּנָפַיִם cannot be said of waters out of such connection as in chap. viii. 8. Besides, צִלְצַל is not an appropriate onomatopoeic word for the noise of weapons and waves. Or, again, it has been explained as "land of the double shadow" (Grotius, Vitringa, Knobel, and others). But however appropriate this epithet (*ἀμφίσκιος*) is for the southmost part of Ethiopia as a tropical country, yet it is hazardous to take צִלְצַל in a meaning which is not sustained by the usage of the language; and the same objection holds to Luzzatto's interpretation, "land of the far and wide shadowing defence." Schelling has also correctly remarked against this view, that the shadow in countries between the tropics is not a double shadow at the same time (thrown now to the north and now to the south), and therefore that it cannot be figuratively called double-winged. צִלְצַל כְּנָפַיִם is the whirring of the wings of the insects with which Egypt and Ethiopia swarm on account of their climate and abundance of water; צְלָצַל, *constr.* צִלְצַל, *tinnitus stridor*,[1] its primary meaning from which the three other meanings of the word: cymbal, harpoon (*i.e.* a whirring dart), and grasshopper,[2] are derived. The Egyptian power was called, in chap. vii. 18, the fly from the end of the rivers of Egypt. Here Egypt-Ethiopia is called the land of the whirring of wings, inasmuch as the prophet, in association with the swarms of insects, has in his mind the motley swarms of people of this great kingdom, which were fabulously strange for an Asiatic. Within this great kingdom

[1] The meaning *stridere* becomes more particularly to sink down with a whirling motion, and in the Talmud, to have settled down, to be cleared (צְלוּל, *limpidus*).

[2] *Tzaltzalya* in the language of the Gallas, *Tsetse* in the language of the Bechuanas, is the name of the most dreaded insect (*diptera*) of the tropical interior of Africa, a species of *glossina*; see Hartmann, *Skizze der Nilländer*, i. 205; *Ausland*, 1865, p. 960, and Merinsky, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss Süd-Afrikas*, 1875, pp. 23–25 (where it is stated that the poison of the tsetse has a fatal effect only on the domestic animals, the ass being an exception). Bruce first brought this insect to England, and the first account of the "Tsaltsalya-fly" is found in vol. v. of Bruce's *Select Specimens* (1790).

messengers are now passing to and fro upon its great waters בִּכְלֵי גֹמֶא, in boats of papyrus (see about גֹּמֶא, explained by Saadia by بردى, in my comm. on Job, chap. viii. 11); in Greek *βάριδες* (Ionic in Herodotus, ii. 96, *βάριες*) *παπύριναι* (*βαρίς*, after the Egyptian *bari, bali*, barge), cf. Lucan, *Phars.* 4. 136: *conseritur bibula Memphitis cymba papyro.* In such canoes, *ex papyro et scirpo et harundine* (Plinius, vii. 206, xiii. 72, ed. Jan.), they skimmed along the Nile, and ventured even as far as *Taprobane* (Ceylon). They were made for folding together (*plicatiles*), so that they could be carried past the cataracts (rapids), Arab *šellálât* (see Parthey on *Plutarch de Iside*, p. 198 f.).

It is to the messengers in such paper boats that the appeal of the prophet is directed. He bids them go and summon the mighty Ethiopian people to the combat: to a combat, however, which Jehovah will in their place take upon Himself. Vers. 2*b*, 3: "*Go, fleet messengers, to the nation long-stretched and beautifully polished, to the terrible people far away on the other side, to the nation of command on command and treading down, whose land rivers cut through. All ye possessors of the world and inhabitants of the earth, when a banner rises on mountains, look thither, and when they blow the trumpet, then hear!*" They are to go to the powerful people which will not be the prey of Assyria, but the prey of Jehovah; for He Himself will save the world from the conquering might of Assyria, against which the Ethiopian kingdom summons all the means of self-help. That to which the looks of Ethiopia and all the peoples of the earth are directed is made known to us by what follows: it is the destruction of Assyria by Jehovah. And they who look are particularly to attend and mark when they perceive the two signals of the banner and the trumpet blast: these are decisive moments. The people which is called to arms is described as being so glorious a people, not because it will actually join in the combat, but because it will be Jehovah's own people. It is מְמֻשָּׁךְ, long-extended, tall (LXX. *ἔθνος μετέωρον*), by which the Sabeans are likewise designated in chap. xlv. 14 (cf. ممشوق, in the sense *élancé*, from مشق, to extend long);

and then מוֹרָט = מְמֹרָט,[1] polished, *politus*, especially by depilation (cf. أَمْرَد, *imberbis*, of a youth), and therefore not marred by a disfiguring growth of hair. To these first two predicates corresponds the description of the Ethiopians in Herodotus, iii. 20, as *μέγιστοι καὶ κάλλιστοι ἀνθρώπων πάντων*; and as to the glittering of their skin see also Herodotus, iii. 23.[2] They are further called the terrible people, by reference to the wide extent of their kingdom to the remotest south. מִן־הוּא וְהָלְאָה, from here (compare the vulgar Arabic *min henne*, hitherwards), where the prophet meets with the messengers further and always further out; cf. 1 Sam. xx. 21, 22 (but not 1 Sam. xviii. 9, where the expression has a temporal meaning, which is less suitable here, where everything is so picturesque; and, besides, it is to be rejected, because מִן־הוּא cannot be equivalent to מֵאֲשֶׁר הוּא, cf. Nah. ii. 9). In Homer they are also *τηλόθ' ἐόντες*, those dwelling far off. Nägelsbach connects the mention of place with נורא: feared far from its boundary; but then מן־הוא would be superfluous. What קָו (with a connecting accent and before Makkeph קַו), a measure or criterion, means, when used by the prophet in the reduplicated form in which it is presented here, is shown by chap. xxviii. 10, 13; or if these parallels are rejected by Ps. xix. 5, it is a commanding people that conquers region on region, or (according to Ewald, Knobel, and Cheyne) a people "of strength strength," *i.e.* terribly strong; and this view would recommend itself were קָו = קֹוָּה, strength, established as a meaning in the Hebrew (the radical idea being stiff, compact). מְבוּסָה is a second genitive to גּוֹי: a people of treading down, namely, of others, *i.e.* which subdues and tramples down wherever it appears, as had been conspicuously shown since Pianchi, about 766 B.C.[3] The Tirhāka (*Τεάρκων*) is called by Megasthenes in Strabo, xv. 1. 6, a great conqueror who pressed

[1] So, too, שְׁעָרִים in Jer. xxix. 17 is equivalent to מְשֻׁעָרִים, abhorred, abominable.

[2] See on this also the description of the *Barâbira* (plur. of *Berberî*), probably epigons of the ancient Ethiopians, in the *Zeitschrift für allg. Erdkunde*, xvii. 7.

[3] See Stade's monograph, *De Isaiae vaticiniis aethiopicis*, 1873.

forward to the pillars of Hercules. These are purely predicates of distinction: an imposingly beautiful people, a ruling and conquering people. The last predicate אֲשֶׁר בָּזְאוּ extols their fruitful land. We do not take בָּזָא in the sense of *diripere* = בָּזַז, as מָאַס, to melt = מָסַס, but in the sense of *findere* = בָּזַע, as גָּמָא, to sip = גָּמַע; for it is no praise to say that a land is carried off or washed away by rivers. Böttcher aptly compares the phrase used by Herodotus, ii. 108, *κατετμήθη ἡ Αἴγυπτος*. There is a divine irony lying in the circumstance that a people so great and glorious, and (looking at its natural gifts) not without reason so full of self-feeling, falls into such violent excitement in presence of the threatening danger and makes such violent efforts to meet it, while Jehovah, the God of Israel, will Himself annihilate the power that threatens the danger in a night, and consequently that all the anxiety and labour of Ethiopia is utterly useless.

The prophet knows this for certain. Vers. 4–6: "*For thus hath Jehovah spoken to me: I will be still, and will look on upon my throne during clear heat in sunshine, during dew-clouds in the harvest glow. For before the harvest, when the blossom fades off and the bud becomes a ripening grape, then will He cut off the vine shoots with vine-pruners, and He removes, breaks off the tendrils. Left are they altogether to the birds of prey of the mountains, and to the cattle of the land, and the birds of prey summer thereon, and all the cattle of the land will winter thereon.*" The prophecy expounds itself here; for the unfigurative ver. 6 undoubtedly enables us to understand what it is that Jehovah without interposing will let develope prosperously under favourable circumstances till He suddenly and violently puts an end to it just as it is approaching perfect maturity. It is the power of Assyria. Jehovah calmly looks on from the heavenly seat of His glorious presence without disturbing the progression of what is intended. This rest of His is not neglectfulness; it is, as is indicated by the cohortatives (the second of which is provided with ŏ under the half-guttural ק; cf. Num. xxiii. 25), well considered resolution. The two Caphs (כְּ) in ver. 4 are not comparative, but are indicative of time. The noun עָב, thickness, darkness, cloud, is in the construct עַב, or even עַב, as יָם is sometimes יַם, sometimes יַם, being the latter according to the mode of

derivatives from עָלָה. Jehovah keeps Himself at rest while there is bright heat with sunshine (עָלַי, of a continuing state, as in Jer. viii. 18, 1 Sam. xiv. 32, and elsewhere), and whilst there is dew-cloud, בְּחֹם קָצִיר (LXX. Syr. erroneously ביום), *i.e.* in the midst of that warmth which is favourable for the harvest, so that the plant thus heated through by day and refreshed at night by the falling dew shoots up rapidly and luxuriantly, and ripens. The plant thought of is the vine, as is shown by ver. 5. It is erroneous to take קָצִיר in the sense of בָּצִיר (see xvi. 9): it is the grain harvest at whose approach the vine blossom fades and the berry sets, with which the summer heat, during which the grapes ripen (Hofmann), coincides. בְּ is also here indicative of time. When the blossom has become complete, so that it now fades off, and the set fruit-bud (נִצָּה, according to the Masora here, in distinction from Gen. xl. 10 with ה *rafatum*) becomes a ripening grapelet (בֹּסֶר, the still unripe grape, ὄμφαξ, so called from its hardness and sourness, as בֻּסַר is the unripe date), he cuts away the vine branches, זַלְזַלִּים (from זָלַל, to swing to and fro; cf. Arabic *dâliya*, grape, from *dalâ*, to hang long and loose), on which the grapes that will soon be quite ripened hang; and the tendrils (נְטִישׁוֹת, as in Jer. v. 10, from נָטַשׁ, to stretch far down, Niphal, to twine for a long way, chap. xvi. 8; cf. Jer. xlviii. 32) he removes, nips off (הַתֵּז, a pausal form for הַתְּז, as טָבְאֵל is for טְבַאֵל in chap. vii. 6, Olsh. § 91*d*, from תָּזַז, Hiphil in Talmud, התיז, to break off, to break in two, to weaken; cf. תְּשַׁשׁ), an intentional asyndeton with a picturesque sound. The discourse of Jehovah concerning Himself has here passed imperceptibly into a discourse of the prophet about Jehovah. The ripening grapes are, as is elucidated in ver. 6, the Assyrians now not far from the summit of their power, and the fruit-branches that are lopped off and broken to pieces are their corpses, which are now summer and winter through the garbage of swarms of summer birds and of the beasts of prey that remain through the winter. (קַיִץ is a denominative from קַיִץ, glowing heat = summer, and תַּחֲרֹף, denominative, from חָרֶף, plucking off = harvest.) This is the divine act of judgment to which the approaching planting of the banner and the approaching blare of trumpets is about to call the atten-

tion of the people of Ethiopia. What effect this act of Jehovah if it now takes place will exercise upon the people of Ethiopia is now described. Ver. 7: "*At that time will there be offered as a homage to the Lord of hosts a people long-stretched and beautifully polished, and from a terrible people far away on the other side, a nation of command upon command and treading down, whose land rivers cut through, to the place of the name of Jehovah of hosts, the mountain of Zion.*" To the difficult מֵעָם the עַם at the beginning does not require to be accommodated (for which Knobel indeed reads מֵעַם); that which is offered is the Ethiopian people itself, just as it is Israel in chap. lxvi. 20; Zeph. iii. 10. Along with עַם and גּוֹי, nominatives of the subject, מֵעָם can only have a local signification: the people brings itself as a present, and presents are brought from it (Nägelsbach); but for what purpose is this weakening alteration made? It is probable that ומ is an inadvertent "dittography," and should be deleted. Cheyne translates twice: *from the people;* but the former עם is guaranteed by parallels, as in Zeph. iii. 10. Ethiopia is offered or presents itself as an offering to Jehovah, being impelled irresistibly to this by the force of the impression made by the great deed of Jehovah, or as the Titan among the Psalms says (Ps. lxviii. 32): "There come thither the splendid ones out of Egypt, and Cush hastily stretches his hands to Elohim." In order that the greatness of this spiritual conquest may be fully appreciated, the description of this strangely glorious people is here repeated.

The Oracle concerning Egypt, Chap. XIX.

The three prophecies in chaps. xviii., xix., xx. form a trilogy. The first (chap. xviii., which, like the *introitus*, chap. i., is without any special superscription) treats of Ethiopia in language of the sublimest pathos. The second (chap. xix.) treats of Egypt in language of calmer description, which is expanded to some length; and the third (chap. xx.) treats of Egypt and Ethiopia in a setting of plain historical prose. The kingdom to which all the three prophecies refer is the same, namely, the Egypto-Ethiopian kingdom; but it is so dealt with that chap. xviii. refers to the ruling people, chap. xix. to the ruled people, and chap. xx. embraces them

both together. The reason why the prophecy occupies itself so particularly with Egypt is that no people of the earth was so closely interwoven with the history of the kingdom of God from the patriarchal time as Egypt. And because, as the Thora impresses it, Israel must never forget that it long resided in Egypt, and there grew great, and enjoyed much good; so prophecy, when it comes to speak to Egypt, is not less zealous in promising than in threatening. Accordingly the Isaianic מַשָּׂא falls into two distinct halves: one threatening, vers. 1–15, and one promising, vers. 18–25; and between judgment and salvation there stands the terror in vers. 16, 17, as the bridge from the former to the latter. And just as is the greatness of the coil of punishments which the prophet unfolds, so in just as many stages is the promise which is carried on in ever new grooves, and which here rises so far that at last, breaking through the temporary historical veil and the Old Testament limitation, it speaks the spiritual language of the world-embracing love of the New Testament.

With a short introduction—in the use of which Isaiah was a master—which concentrates the whole of what is contained in the first half in a few weighty words, and three times naming Egypt, the land unequalled in the world, the oracle thus begins. Ver. 1: "*Behold, Jehovah rides along upon a light cloud, and comes to Egypt; then the idols of Egypt shake before Him, and the heart of Egypt melts within it.*" Jehovah rides upon clouds when He is about to reveal Himself in judicial majesty (Ps. xviii. 11), and here He rides upon a light cloud, because it is to happen rapidly. קַל signifies light and quick; what is light moves itself quickly; and even the light, because thin cloud, is relatively עָב, literally, dense, opaque, dark. The idols of Egypt shake (נוּעַ, as in chap. vi. 4, vii. 2), for Jehovah comes over them to judgment (cf. Ex. xii. 12; Jer. xlvi. 25; Ezek. xxx. 13). They must shake, for they are about to be thrown down; their shaking from fear is a shaking to their fall (נוּעַ, as in chap. xxiv. 20, xxix. 9). The ו of וְנָעוּ (*pract. consec.* with tone on the last) connects cause and effect, as in chap. vi. 7.

In what judgments the judgment is about to be executed is now declared by the majestic Judge Himself. Vers. 2–4: "*And I goad Egypt against Egypt, and they go to war every*

one with his brother, and every one with his neighbour; city against city, kingdom against kingdom. And the spirit of Egypt is emptied out within it, and I swallow up its readiness in counsel, and they go inquiring to the idols, and to the mutterers, and to the oracle-spirits, and to the soothsayers. And I shut up Egypt in the hand of a hard government, and a violent king will rule over them, saith the Lord, Jehovah of hosts." Civil war will rage in Egypt (on סְכָכָה see at chap. ix. 10). The people usually so prudent will not be able to deliberate; their spirit is quite poured out (נְבֻקָּה, with the dropped reduplication for נְבָקָה, as נְסֻבָּה = נְסַבָּה, Ezek. xli. 7, cf. comm. on Gen. xi. 7), so that nothing of insight or resolution remains to them. Then in their blindness they turn for help in counsel and action to where none is to be found—to their nothings of gods, and to the manifold demoniacal arts of which Egypt could boast that it was the primeval abode. On the names of the practisers of the black art see chap. viii. 19. אַטִּים, mutterers, from אָטַט = אָטַל, to squeak (used of a camel's saddle, especially when it is new), to rumble (of the empty stomach), and such like (see Lane's *Lexicon*). But all this avails them nothing. Jehovah gives them up (סָכַר, syn. הִסְגִּיר, *συγκλείειν*, and מָכַר) to be under a hard-hearted, severe king. The prophecy does not refer to a foreign conqueror, so as to lead us to think of Sargon (Knobel, Kuenen, Schrader, Cheyne, Driver) or Cambyses (Luzzatto), but to a native despot. In comparing the prophecy with the fulfilment, we must above all keep firmly to the view that ver. 2 prophesies the national revolution which broke out in Sais, in the midst of which the Ethiopian dynasty, which ruled from 725, was overthrown, and the federal Dodekarchy, which sprang out of the national rising. Hitzig denies this, but only because he holds it to be impossible that the prophetic glance of Isaiah could extend to events after his death. Stade[1] refers the prophecy to the subjection of Middle and Lower Egypt, and especially of the Saitic prince and conqueror, Tafnecht, by the Ethiopian

[1] *Op. cit.* pp. 31–33; cf. "Die Siegesinschrift Königs Pianchi von Aethiopien, übers. von H. Brugsch," in the *Nachrichten der Kgl. Göttinger Gesellschaft d. W.* 1876, Nr. 19. Wiedemann, *Aegyptische Geschichte*, Teil 2 (1884), pp. 565–576.

Pianchi-Meremen, which he dates between 729 and 722. But with this interpretation of the Isaianic prophecy would there not rather be expected, according to the stele of Mount Barkat, instead of מצרים במצרים, rather כושים במצרים? The מַמְלָכָה בְּמַמְלָכָה (LXX. *νομὸς ἐπὶ νομόν*) does not apply nearly so well to the time of Tafnecht and Pianchi as to those twelve small kingdoms into which Egypt was divided after the removal of the Ethiopian dynasty, till Psammetichus, the Dodekarch of Sais, again united these twelve States into one monarchy, a result which Pianchi was not able to bring about. Shabaka (the Sabakon of Manetho), the Biblical סוא, undertook not only a victorious campaign to Egypt, like Pianchi, and not only made it tributary, but remained there, and was the first Egyptian Pharaoh of Ethiopian race (founder of the XXV. dynasty).[1] Psammetichus I. (604–610) was the first to restore the unity of the kingdom. He (and generally the royal house of the Psammetichidæ) is the hard ruler, the ruthless despot. After long struggles, and by the aid of mercenaries of Ionia and Caria, he attained sole undisputed dominion over Egypt. From him onwards the characteristic Egyptian system appears already much broken by the admixture of Hellenism, which led in consequence to the emigration of a large portion of the military caste to Meroë (Herod. ii. 30; Diod. i. 67). How oppressive this new dynasty was came to be felt by the Egyptian people, when Necho (616–597), the son and successor of Psammetichus, took up anew the project of Ramses Miamun to construct a connecting canal between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, and tore away 120,000 natives from their homes and wore them out in toilsome drudgery (Herod. ii. 158). A revolt of the native troops which, being sent against the rebelling Cyrene, were driven back into the desert, brought about, after losing a battle, the fall of Hophra' (*Ἀπρίης* of Herodotus and Diodorus), the grandson of Necho, in 570, and put an end to the hated government of the house of Psammetichus (Herod. ii. 161 sqq., iv. 159).

The prophet now prophesies another calamity which is coming upon Egypt: the Nile dries up, and with it vanishes the fruitfulness of the land. Vers. 5–10: "*And the waters*

[1] See Wiedemann, *op. cit.* p. 581.

will dry up from the sea, and the river becomes parched and dried. And the arms of the river spread a stench; the canals of Masor become shallow and parched; reed and rush shrivel up. The meadows by the Nile, at the mouth of the Nile, and every seed-field of the Nile dries up, scatters in dust and disappears. And the fishers groan, and all who throw hoop-nets into the Nile mourn, and they who spread out the net on the face of the water languish away. And confounded are the workers of fine-combed flax and the weavers of cotton fabrics. And the pillars of the land become crushed to pieces, all who work for hire grieved in soul." The Nile in ver. 5 (as well as in chap. xviii. 1; cf. Nah. iii. 8) is called יָם, just as Homer calls it *ὠκεανός*, which, as Diodorus (i. 19) observes, is the native name of the river, the Egyptian *oham;* the corresponding Arabic name is يَمّ; as here it is called *yām* in the Beǵawîya idiom of Besharîn. The Nile is really more like an inland sea than a river from that point where the main stream in consequence of the swelling of the two great Abyssinian tributaries of the Blue Nile and the Atbara overflows the delta of Lower Egypt, assuming this appearance in consequence of its breadth and of its stagnating in the dry season. It is not till the beginning of the tropical rains that the swelling river begins to flow more rapidly, and the יָם becomes נָהָר. But when, as is threatened here, the Nile sea and the Nile river of Upper Egypt fall together and dry up (נִשְׁתּוּ, Niphal, either from שָׁתַת, ✓ שת, to set, to place = נָשַׁתּוּ, to set oneself, to become shallow; or rather from נָשַׁת, since chap. xli. 17 and Jer. li. 30 warrant us assuming such a secondary verb), then the arms of the mouth of the Nile (נְהָרוֹת), which flow through the delta and the many canals (יְאֹרִים) which convey to the Nile valley the blessing of the overflow, become stinking pools (הֶאֱזִנִיחוּ, a half nominal, a half verbal Hiphil, unexampled elsewhere; to spread a stench, formed from the elative אַזְנָח or אֶזְנָח, which is not found, perhaps in order to distinguish it from הֶזְנִיחַ, which means to abhor, to make an abhorrence). Probably it is not without intention that Isaiah says מָצוֹר, seeing that he distinguishes מָצוֹר and פַּתְרוֹס in chap. xi. 11 as Lower and Upper Egypt, Egyptian *sa-hēt*, lower land, and *sa-rēs*, upper land (together forming

מִצְרַיִם). And we are warranted in taking יְאֹרִים (standing beside נְהָרוֹת) as a name for the canals of the Nile. The canals and irrigation system of Egypt are older than the invasion of the Hyksos. On the other hand, יְאוֹר in ver. 7 (thrice written *plene*, as also in ver. 8) is the Egyptian name of the Nile generally (*aur*, river, or *aur-āa*, great river), which is thrice repeated with emphasis like the name מִצְרַיִם in ver. 1. On סוּף, a reed, Egyptian *sebe*, see comm. on Ps. cvi. 9. Parallel with מִזְרָע, but different from it, stands עָרוֹת from עָרָה, *nudum esse*, which, like several derivatives of the synonymous verb عرى, signifies open places, and here grass flats situated beside the water, and therefore meadows. Even the meadows close to the mouth of the river (see on Prov. viii. 29), *i.e.* where it flows to the neighbouring sea, and all the fields become so dry that they go off in dust like ashes. The three chief sources of the nourishment of Egypt thus fail also, viz. the fishing, the manufacture of linen which supplied the dresses of the priests and bandages for the mummies, and the manufacture of cotton which provided all who were not priests with material for clothing. In ver. 8 no objection need be taken to the view which assumes an inversion for משליכי חכה ביאר; this obstruction is less striking where the governing word has *Chirek compaginis* in chap. xxii. 16; Gen. xlix. 11. שְׂרִיקוֹת might be adj. to the feminine פִּשְׁתִּים from פִּשְׁתָּה, but it is according to the accents the accus. of manner: by means of repeated careful combing (cf. סָרוֹק, wool-combers, *Kelim* xii. 2). The mode of working the flax is shown us on the monuments; and in the Berlin Museum there are some of these Egyptian combs with which they carded the flax. The fabrics of the Egyptian looms were celebrated in antiquity; חוֹרֵי, literally, white stuff (a singular only with the old termination *ay*), from חוּר or חָוַר, *candidum esse* (cf. חרר, *candere*), is the collective name for cotton stuffs or the different kinds of byssus which were woven there (cf. *βυσσίνων ὀθονίων* of the Rosetta inscription).[1] All the castes from the highest to the lowest fall into the pain of despair.

[1] Luzzatto and Pinsker (*Einleitung in das babyl. Punktationssystem*, p. 133) correct as follows: "And the flax-workers are put to shame (*athnach*), the carders (but would not that be שׂוֹרְקוֹת?) and weavers become pale."

The שָׁתוֹת (a designation perhaps suggested by the thought of שְׁתִי, the warp of the web, Syr. אַשְׁתִּי, to weave), *i.e.* pillars of the land (with a feminine suffix relating to מְצָרַיִם, see on chap. iii. 8, and construed as masculine, as in Ps. xi. 3), are the highest castes who directly support the edifice of the State; and עֹשֵׂי שֵׂכָר cannot mean the citizens engaged in trade or the middle class of the people, but those who, being hired to those who provide labour, live not on their own property but on wages (שָׂכָר, as in Prov. xi. 18, according to Rashi on this passage; cf. comm. on Prov. xxvi. 10 = סָכָר: the dammers of water for the purpose of fishing, like סַכָּרִין, *Kelim* xxiii. 5).[1]

The prophet now pauses to describe the punishment inflicted on the pillars of the land. Vers. 11–13: "*Utter fools do the princes of Zoan become, the wise counsellors of Pharaoh; readiness in counsel is stupefied. How can ye say to Pharaoh: I am a son of wise men, a son of kings of the early time?—Where are they, then, thy wise men? Let them then announce to thee and know what Jehovah of hosts has resolved concerning Egypt! The princes of Zoan are stultified, the princes of Memphis deceived; they have led Egypt astray, who are the corner-stone of its castes.*" The two constructs חַכְמֵי יֹעֲצֵי do not stand in subordination but in co-ordination (see comm. on Ps. lxxviii. 9; Job xx. 17, and compare 2 Kings xvii. 13, *Kerî*), the wise men, counsellors of Pharaoh, so that the second name is the explanatory permutative of the first. צֹעַן is = *Tanis*, lying between the Sebennytic and the Pelusian arm of the Nile, anciently (Num. xiii. 22) a capital of the Hyksos, and restored after their destruction by Ramses II. It was the parent seat of two dynasties. נֹף *per aphaer.* = מֹנֹף, *contr.* כֹּף in Hos. ix. 6, is Memphis,[2] which was raised by Psammetichus to be the metropolis of the whole kingdom. On its ruined site now stands the village of

So Rashi, understanding עשי שבר to be used of dyke labourers, understands אגמי נפש to be fish-ponds, which is untenable. On the other hand, the view of Ehrentreu is probable, that the choice of the word אגמי was occasioned by אֲגַמִּים (water tanks formed by means of confining dykes); see above at chap. i. 31.

[2] With this Greek form of the name the Assyrian name agrees: *Mê-im-pi*, *Mi-im-pi* (*Paradies*, p. 314). The original Egyptian form is *Men-nefer* (Plutarch, *de Is.* 20: ὄρμος ἀγαθῶν).

Mitrehêne (according to Seetzen), and to the north-west of it is the Serapeum. Princes of Zoan and Memphis were therefore princes belonging to the most distinguished cities of the country, and, as may be assumed, of primeval pedigree; they were probably priest-princes; for the wisdom of the Egyptian priests was of world-wide renown (Herodotus, ii. 77, 260), and out of the priest caste sprang the oldest kings of Egypt. Even in the time of Hezekiah, when the military caste had long become the ruling one, the priests again succeeded in raising one of their own number, Sethos, to the throne of Sais. These magnates of Egypt with their wisdom will be made fools by the history of Egypt in the immediate future, and—this is the meaning of the sarcastic אֵיךְ תֹּאמְרוּ—they will not trust themselves further to boast of their priestly hereditary wisdom or their royal hereditary nobility when counselling Pharaoh. קֶדֶם does not mean here "east" as in 1 Kings v. 10, but primeval time. They are the corner-stone of the שִׁבְטִים, *i.e.* of the castes of Egypt (not of the districts or divisions, *νομοί*, פַּלְכָהָא, as it is rendered in the Targum). But instead of supporting and protecting their people, as it now appears, they have plunged it into error. הִתְעוּ has here—as is observed by the Masora on ver. 14—no *waw cop.*

This state of disorder is now more minutely described in vers. 14, 15: "*Jehovah has poured into Egypt's heart a spirit of giddiness so that they have led Egypt astray in all its doing as a drunken man wanders about in his vomit. And there is not done of Egypt a work which worked, of head and tail, palm branch and rush.*" The spirit which God pours into them is a spirit of judgment, and has for its judicial penal result עִוְּעִים, which is formed from עִוְּעוּ (√ עו, to curve), and is abridged from עִוְּעִים, or points back to a singular עִוְּעָה. The suffix of בְּקִרְבָּהּ refers to Egypt. The divine punitive spirit makes use of the fancied wisdom of the priestly caste, and by it throws the people, as it were, into the giddiness of intoxication. The prophet uses the Hiphil הִתְעָה of the carefully meditated doings of the leaders of the people, and the Niphal נִתְעָה of the state of the drunken man when he is no longer free nor master of himself. The people is made so perverse by false counsels and hopes that it lies there like a drunk man in his

own vomit, and, not being able to extricate itself, it gropes and rolls about therein. A work which worked or was effective, *i.e.* which brought it out of the disorder (עָשָׂה, as frequently of persons, *e.g.* in Dan. viii. 24), is brought to a successful result by no one; neither by the heads of the people, nor by the common people and its flatterers; neither by the upper classes nor by the masses.

The result of all these plagues which come upon Egypt is fear of Jehovah and of Jehovah's people. Vers. 16, 17: "*In that day the Egyptians become like women, and they tremble, and they shudder before the swing of the hand of Jehovah of hosts, which He sets into swing against them. And the land of Judah becomes a dread to Egypt: as often as they mention this against Egypt, it shudders,—on account of the decree of Jehovah of hosts which He suspends over it.*" The swinging, תְּנוּפָה, of the hand (chap. xxx. 32) points back to the foregoing judgments as they smite Egypt with blow after blow. These humiliations make the Egyptians as soft and timid as women. The accent on וְהָרַד is separative (*Mehuppach Legarmeh*). Further, the sacred ground and soil of Judah (אֲדָמָה, as in chap. xiv. 1, 2, xxxii. 13), which Egypt has so often made the scene of war, throws them, whenever it is but mentioned (כֹּל אֲשֶׁר, cf. 1 Sam. ii. 13; Gen. iv. 15: literally whoever, but = as often as any one), into frenzy, into an excitement of terror (חָנָא, with א instead of ה, like זָרָא in Num. xi. 20, קָרָחָא in Ezek. xxxvii. 31; cf. כְּלָא, Ezek. xxxvi. 5, and similar in form with *morrah* in Prov. xiv. 10). The originator of the plagues is known to them. Their faith in the idols is shaken, and the wish naturally rises in them to avert new plagues by propitiation of Jehovah.

At first there is only slavish fear, but it is the beginning of a turn for the better. Ver. 18: "*In that day there will be five cities in the land Egypt speaking the language of Canaan and swearing by Jehovah of hosts, 'Ir ha-Heres will one be called.'*" Five cities are few for Egypt,[1] which is sowed over with cities (townships); but this is only a fractional beginning of the future complete conversion of Egypt. It is an

[1] Herodotus (ii. 177) gives the number of them as 20,000 in the time of Amasis; Diodorus (i. 31) gives their number as 18,000 in ancient times, and under Ptolemy Lagi, 30,000.

external sign of this conversion that the converted begin to speak the language of Canaan, *i.e.* the holy language of the worship of Jehovah (cf. Zeph. iii. 9), and that they devote themselves with a sworn vow to the God of Israel in words of this language. נִשְׁבַּע לְ (different from נִשְׁבַּע בְּ, chap. lxv. 16, as chap. xlv. 23 shows) means to swear to any one, to promise him fealty, to give oneself up to him. One of these five will be called עִיר הַהֶרֶס. As this must be a proper name, לְאֶחָת thus means not *unieuique*, as in Judg. viii. 18, Ezek. i. 6, but *uni*. It is the habit of Isaiah to express the nature of a thing in the form of a future name of it (chap. iv. 3, xxxii. 5, lxi. 6, lxii. 4). This name must therefore here have a distinguishing meaning in accordance with the promise. But what does עִיר הַהֶרֶס mean? The LXX. has changed it into *πόλις ἀσεδέκ*, עִיר הַצֶּדֶק, in honour of the Jewish temple, which was founded by Onias IV., the son of the high priest Onias III., when he emigrated to Egypt, and found a friendly reception from Ptolemy VI. Philometor and his wife Cleopatra (about 160 B.C.). The הֶרֶס, handed down in the Masoretic text, can mean nothing else than destruction, and it naturally occurs to read for it עִיר הַהֶרֶס (which is also given in some codices,[1] but is contrary to the Masora). It is unnecessary to interpret this according to the Arabic as meaning city of protection (Rosenmüller, Ewald, Knobel, Meier) = المحروسة, *divinitus protecta*. עִיר הַהֶרֶס means city of the sun (חֶרֶס, as in Job ix. 7; Judg. xiv. 18), as the Talmud in the leading passage concerning the בית חוניו (the Onias temple) in *Menachoth* 110*a* considers that the traditional reading is to be understood in accordance with Job ix. 7 (לישנא דשימשא היא, "it is a designation of the sun").[2] "Sun-city" was actually the name of one of the most famous old Egyptian cities, namely, *Ἡλιούπολις*, situated to the north-east of Memphis, the city of the sun-god *Ra*, which elsewhere in the

[1] On the other hand, no Greek Cod. reads *πόλις ἀχερές*, into which the Compl. has emended it after the Vulgate, see the *Vocabularium Hebr.* 37*a* belonging to the Compl. A Hebrew MS. in St. Petersburg has the reading עִיר הַפֶּרֶךְ transcribed in inverted order from the Greek, see *DMZ.* xx. 459.

[2] In this sense of "sun-city will one be called," these words are the device on the coat of arms of the Andalusian city Ecija; see von Vincenti, *In Glut und Eis*, Bd. ii. 165.

Old Testament is called אוֹן,[1] a name which Ezekiel (chap. xxx. 17) modifies into אָוֶן, in order to brand the idolatry of the city. If the well-attested reading הַהֶרֶס is retained, it can only be taken as meaning "tearing down of the previous heathen sanctuaries" (הרס, as in Judg. vi. 25; 1 Kings xviii. 30, xix. 10, 14), and the meaning of the prophecy will be that the city, which was hitherto עִיר הַהֶרֶס, the chief city of the sun-worship, will become the city of the destruction of idolatry (Caspari, Drechsler, Herzfeld), as Jeremiah prophesies, chap. xliii. 13: "Jehovah will break in pieces the obelisks of the sun-temple in the land of Egypt." עיר ההרס, with this interpretation, has essentially the same relation to עיר החרס as בית און to בית אל, and, so far as this is interpreted according to Hos. x. 8, cf. xii. 12, means: the sun-city becomes a city of ruins. The prophet is here thinking of the temples and altars, and also in particular of the מַצֵּבוֹת, obelisks (see Jer. xliii. 13), which stood there on the spot where *Ra* was worshipped.

Vers. 19, 20: "*In that day there stands an altar consecrated to Jehovah in the midst of the land of Egypt, and an obelisk near the boundary of the land consecrated to Jehovah. And a sign and a witness for Jehovah of hosts is this in the land Egypt: when they cry to Jehovah because of oppressors, He will send them a helper and combatant, and save them.*" This is the passage of Isaiah (not ver. 18) to which Onias IV. appealed when he sought permission from Ptolemy Philometor to build the temple of Jehovah in Egypt. He built it in the nome of Heliopolis, 180 stadia to the north-east of Memphis (Jos. *Bell.* vii. 10. 3), and particularly on the ground and soil of the ὀχύρωμα in Leontopolis which was consecrated to Bubastis (*Ant.* xiii. 3. 1, 2).[2] This temple, built like a

[1] Ἡλιούπολις corresponds to the sacred name *Pe-ra*, house of the sun-god, which is borne by the city otherwise called אוֹן, old Egyptian *Anu*; nevertheless Cyril also explains this name thus: Ὼν δέ ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἥλιος, that is *Ain*, *Oin*, *Oni*, the eye as emblem of the sun. Perhaps with reference to this Heliopolis is called in Arabic *'Ain-eš-šems*, see Arnold, *Chrestom. arab.* p 56 f. Edrîsi (iii. 3) calls this *Ain-eš-šems*, "the pleasure seat of the Pharaoh, whom may God curse," just as *ibn el-Faraun* is an insulting designation of the Coptic fellah.

[2] Perhaps the present Tel el-Jehûdi points to the site of the old Jewish temple (Ebers, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai*, p. 497).

fortress, was externally unlike that of Jerusalem; it stood for more than two hundred years (160 B.C.–72 A.D., when it was closed by command of Vespasian). It was magnificently equipped and much frequented, yet its recognition was a subject of dispute in Palestine and even in Egypt itself. It really lay בְּתוֹךְ אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם; but it is not feasible to see in that temple the fulfilment of the Isaianic prophecy; for this reason of itself, that it was built by Jews and for Jews. And where then would the obelisk have been which, as Isaiah prophesies, was to stand on the boundary of Egypt, *i.e.* on the side of the desert and of Canaan? The altar was not to be in fact a place of sacrifice, but, like the altars in Josh. xxii. 26, 27 and Ex. xvii. 15, was to be אוֹת, a monument that there were worshippers of Jehovah in Egypt, and the obelisk was to be a עֵד that Jehovah had proved Himself for the salvation of Egypt to be the God of the gods of Egypt. And if those who erected this place of worship and this monument now cry to Jehovah, He will show Himself ready to help them, and they will no more cry in vain as they formerly did to their idols (ver. 3). What is here spoken of is therefore the beginning of the conversion of the natives of Egypt. The fact that since the Greek period Judaism became a power in Egypt is certainly not out of relation to this. The Therapeutae, scattered through all the *νομοί* of Egypt as described by Philo (*Opp.* ii. p. 474, ed. Mangey), were of a mixed Egypto-Jewish nature. It was a victory of the Jehovah religion that Egypt was already covered in the pre-Christian period with Jewish synagogues and coenobia. Further, Alexandria did become the place where the law of Jehovah was rendered into Greek and became accessible to the heathen world, and where the religion of Jehovah created for itself the forms of speech and thought in which as Christianity it was to become the religion of the world. So, when Christianity had entered into the world, there were already towards the end of the first century more than one מצבה to be found by any one coming from Palestine to Egypt, and more than one מזבח to be found by any one when he had arrived in the middle of Egypt. Alexandria and the monachism and anchoritism of the Sinaitic peninsula and of

Egypt became of the greatest importance in the history of the spread of Christianity.[1]

When Egypt became the prey of Islam in the year 640, there had been, at least in magnificent prelude, a fulfilment of what the prophet prophesies in vers. 21, 22: "*And Jehovah gives Himself to be known to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians know Jehovah in that day; and they serve with slain-offerings and meat-offerings, and vow vows to Jehovah, and pay them. And Jehovah smites Egypt, smiting and healing; and when they return to Jehovah He lets Himself be entreated, and heals them.*" From that beginning of the five cities, and the solitary altar, and the one solitary obelisk, it has come to this, that Jehovah extends knowledge of Himself to the whole of Egypt (נוֹדַע, reflexive, *se cognoscendum dare*, or neuter, *innotescere*), and throughout all Egypt there arises the knowledge of the God made known in the history of salvation, and this knowledge shows itself in practice. This practice is described by the prophet, as was naturally to be expected, according to the views of the Old Testament, as consisting in the presentation of bloody and bloodless, legal and freewill offerings. וְעָבְדוּ, viz. את־ה', and therefore עָבַד with the double accusative, as in Ex. x. 26; cf. Gen. xxx. 29: or perhaps directly in the sense of to sacrifice (Hitzig), as in the Phoenician, cf. עָשָׂה (*e.g.* in Ps. lxvi. 15), and the classical ἔρδειν, ῥέζειν, *facere, operari;* and even when thus taken it is no evidence against the authorship of Isaiah (cf. chap. xxviii. 21, xxxii. 17). Egypt, though converted, is still always a sinful people, but Jehovah smites them, נָגֹף וְרָפוֹא (cf. 1 Kings xx. 37), so that in the smiting the intention of healing prevails, and healing follows it, since the chastisement of God has the effect of leading them to repentance. Egypt therefore stands now under the same order of salvation as Israel (*e.g.* Lev. xxvi. 44; Deut. xxxii. 36).

Assyria is not less humiliated, as we know from chap. xviii. Accordingly the two great powers, which hitherto only met as enemies, now meet in the worship of Jehovah, which unites them. Ver. 23: "*In that day a road will lead from Egypt to Assur, and Assur comes unto Egypt, and Egypt to Assur; and*

[1] See my Ecclesiastical Chronicle of Arabia Petrea in the *Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1840, 4, and 1841, 1.

Egypt with Assur serves (the Lord)." אֵת is not a sign of the accusative, for there can be no more mention of a subjection of Egypt under Assyria; but it is a preposition of fellowship, and עָבְדוּ is not intended to mean that the two great powers which are now contending for the government of the world will then have become subservient (Hofmann); but it is to be understood, as in ver. 21, where the accusative of manner puts the object out of doubt. In this passage as well as in that one it has the sense of worship. The friendly intercourse between Egypt and Assyria is brought about by both peoples being converted to the God of revelation. The road of communication between them passes through Canaan.

Thus is prepared the highest that the prophet prophesies in vers. 24, 25: "*In that day will Israel be a third to Egypt and Assur, a blessing in the midst of the earth, inasmuch as Jehovah of hosts blesses it, saying: Blessed thou, my people, Egypt, and thou work of my hands, Assur, and thou, mine inheritance, Israel.*" Israel joins the covenant or federation of Egypt and Assyria, so that it becomes a tripartite confederation, in which Israel is שְׁלִשִׁיָּה, *tertia pars* (like עֲשִׂירִיָּה in chap. vi. 13, *decima pars*). Israel, the seed of the patriarch, is now at the goal of its calling: a blessing בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ, in the whole circuit of the earth, the peoples of which are here represented by Egypt and Assyria. Hitherto Israel lay to its own misfortune between Assyria and Egypt. The history of the kingdom of Ephraim, as well as that of Judah, proves this. When Israel leaned on Egypt, it deceived itself and was deceived; and when it leaned on Assyria, it became Assyria's slave, and had Egypt as its enemy. Thus Israel found itself confined in painful straits between the two great powers of the world. How this will now be altered! Egypt and Assyria become one in Jehovah, and Israel is the third party in the alliance or covenant. Israel then is no longer alone God's people, God's creation, God's inheritance, but Egypt and Assyria are each a third sharer with Israel. In order to express this, Israel's three names of honour are mixed together, and each of three peoples receives one of the precious names, of which נַחֲלָתִי is assigned to Israel as pointing back to the beginning of its history. This essential equalization of the heathen peoples with Israel is no degrada-

tion to the latter; for although henceforth there exists no essential distinction of the peoples in their relation to God, it is nevertheless always Israel's God who attains recognition, and Israel is the people which, according to the promise, has become the medium of blessing to the earth. Hence it is unnecessary to take the suffix of בְּרָכוֹ distributively; it applies to Israel, which is blessed by Jehovah since in blessing Egypt and Assyria He takes them along with it. There is thus fulfilled what was promised from of old, that in the seed of Abraham all the kindreds of the earth should bless themselves (Jer. iv. 2), and therefore be blessed; that seed has now really become a בְּרָכָה to all the world.

Thus has the second half of the prophecy ascended step by step from salvation to salvation, just as the first descended step by step from judgment to judgment. The culminating point in ver. 25 corresponds to the lowest point in ver. 15. Every step of the ascending half is marked with a בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. Six times within vers. 16–25 do we read this finger-post pointing to the future. Generally speaking, this ביום ההוא is almost as characteristic of Isaiah as הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים is of Jeremiah (cf. *e.g.* Isa. vii. 18–25). And it is just the promising Messianic parts of the prophecy which love this fugue-like arrangement (chap. xi. 10, 11, xii. 1; cf. Zech. xii., xiii., xiv.). Nevertheless the genuineness of vers. 16–25 has lately been called in question, especially by Hitzig. But Caspari in a special dissertation (*Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1841, 3) has convincingly refuted the reasons put forward for questioning the genuineness of this passage. Cheyne and Driver both leave this whole prophecy to Isaiah as really belonging to him. The two halves of the prophecy are like the two wings of a bird. Moreover, it is only in virtue of its second half that the prophecy becomes the significant middle of the Ethiopic-Egyptian trilogy, for chap. xviii. prophesies the saving effect of the catastrophe of Assyria upon Ethiopia. And that Egypt and Assyria will also be spiritually overcome is prophesied in chap. xix. with its eschatological close, in which Egypt and Assyria are the representatives of the two halves of the heathen world.

The Symbol of the Fall of Egypt and Ethiopia, and its Interpretation, Chap. XX.

This third part of the trilogy, beginning in historical prose, introduces itself thus. Vers. 1, 2*a*: "*In the year when Tartan came to Ashdod, Sargon, the king of Assur, having sent him, and he made war against Ashdod, and took it: at that time spake Jehovah through Isaiah, son of Amos, as follows*," *i.e.* He gave forth the following revelation through the medium of Isaiah (בְּיַד, as in chap. xxxvii. 24; Jer. xxxvii. 2, and frequently), a revelation which was attached to a symbolical acting of it. בְּיַד refers to what is to be announced by the prophet through the medium of what was enjoined upon him, and therefore to ver. 3, and only indirectly to ver. 2*b*. וַיִּלָּחֶם does not begin the apodosis to בִּשְׁנַת; it would then necessarily have been נִלְחַם; but the infinitive construction is thus carried on (cf. Ps. xxxiv. 1, lii. 2, liv. 2, lix. 1), so that בעת ההיא therefore takes up again and universalizes the בִּשְׁנַת. *Tartan* appears in 2 Kings xviii. 17 as the chief general of Sennacherib; the name (in Assyrian *tur-ta-nu*) is not a proper name, but the official title of the commander-in-chief of the army. An Assyrian king, סַרְגֹן,— or, according to the Masoretic correct writing, סַרְגוֹן,—is not named elsewhere in the Old Testament; but we know now that Sargon was the successor of Shalmanassar.[1] The Book of Kings, indeed, names Shalmanassar as the conqueror of Samaria; but the form of expression used in 2 Kings xviii. 10 (וַיִּלְכְּדֶהָ), which generally makes the Assyrians the conquerors, leaves open the possibility that what Shalmanassar begun was brought to an end under the command of another. The Eponym-lists which we now possess put it out of doubt that Shalmanassar IV. reigned as the successor of Tiglath-pileser II. from 727 to 723–2 B.C., and that Sargon, the successor of Shalmanassar IV., reigned from 722 to 705 B.C. It was

[1] On the transition here taking place from the Assyrian ם into the Hebrew שׁ, and the Assyrian ש into the Hebrew ם, see *Complutensische Varianten zum alttest. Texte* (1878), p. 34, cf. 22 (on Hos. x. 14). The name in the inscriptions is *Sar-u-kin*, sometimes also *Sa-ru-kina* (with ם). The interpretation wavers between "the king he commanded" (*ukîn*), *i.e.* God, or "king by right" (*kénu*). The prefixing of the object in *Sarukin* is not surprising in Assyrian syntax (Friedr. Delitzsch, p. 142), but the subject is missed; and therefore the latter interpretation is to be preferred.

Longperrier who first established the identity of the monarch of the palaces of *Khorsâbâd*, which form the north-east corner of ancient Nineveh with the Biblical Sargon. These ruins seem to have been called, down to a late time, صرغون, and the old Assyrian name of the city was *Dûr-Sarrukên* (Sargon's Castle). We still possess a considerable number of inscriptions on bricks, harems, votive tablets, and in other forms, which bear the name of this king, and contain all kinds of testimonies by him to himself.[1] Sargon became the founder of a new dynasty,[2] and appears, after the death of Shalmanassar, to have incorporated the military exploits of the dead monarch in his own list of fame, as if he already had been at that time king. After the fall of Samaria in 722, according to his own annals in the inscriptions, ten years were spent in all sorts of wars with Merodach Baladan of Babylon, Jahubi'di of Hamath, etc., before he again, in the eleventh year of his reign (711), took up the plan of subduing Egypt. The attack upon Ashdod was only a means to this end. As the Philistines were led by their situation, and probably also by their kinship, to take the side of Egypt, the conquest of Ashdod (a fortress so strong that, according to Herodotus, ii. 157, Psammetichus besieged it for twenty-nine years) was an indispensable preliminary of the expedition against Egypt. Alexander the Great, when he marched against Egypt, had to do the same with Gaza. How long Tartan needed is apparently to be inferred from ver. 1. The conquest of Ashdod, according to the terms of ver. 1, took place in the year of the attack. The humiliation of Egypt must have followed not long thereafter, which, at least, is so far in accord with ascertained fact, that, as the annals of Sargon relate, soon after the fall of Ashdod, and in the same year, the king of Ethiopia tendered his submission. But in vers. 3, 4 this submission is dated three years later, reckoning from the time when Isaiah had to go stripped and barefooted. Hence the direction given by Jehovah to Isaiah must have gone forth three years earlier, and the vague בעת ההיא points back to that time. Or otherwise, it

[1] Enumerated by Schrader in his *KAT*², pp. 394–396. [*Die Keilinschriften und das alte Testament*, 2nd ed. Giessen 1883.]

[2] First recognized by Oppert, *Les Inscriptions Assyriennes des Sargonides et les Fastes de Ninive*, Versailles 1862.

belongs to ויאמר, if the punctuation is put thus: In that time after Jehovah had spoken . . . He said. The latter view is the more probable, since דִּבֶּר ה׳ בְּיַד does not introduce a prophecy, but a direction, and therefore what begins with בעת ההיא points to ver. 3.

The direction received ran thus. Ver. 2*b*: "*Go and loosen the frock from thy loins, and draw thy shoes from thy feet! And he did so, went stripped and barefooted.*" We see from this that Isaiah was dressed in the same way as Elijah in 2 Kings i. 8 (cf. Zech. xiii. 4; Heb. xi. 37), who wore a fur coat; and like John the Baptist, who had on a garment of camel's hair, with a leather girdle around it (Matt. iii. 4); for שַׂק is a coarse linen or hairy overcoat of a dark colour (Rev. vi. 12; cf. Isa. l. 3), such as mourners wore either on the bare body (עַל־חַבָּשָׂר, 1 Kings xxi. 27; 2 Kings vi. 30; Job xvi. 15) or over the tunic, in both cases fastened by means of a girdle; and hence not לָבַשׁ, but חָגַר, is the usual word employed to indicate the putting of it on. That the former was the case here is not to be inferred from עָרוֹם (see, on the contrary, 2 Sam. vi. 20, cf. 14; John xxi. 7). Owing to the great importance which is attributed to clothing from the standpoint of Oriental culture and manners, any one who appears without the upper garment is already regarded as naked and bare. Isaiah has to lay off the garment of the preacher of repentance and of the mourner, so that only his tunic, כְּתֹנֶת, remains; and in this dress, and moreover barefooted, he has to appear in public. It is the costume of a man who had been robbed and disgraced, of a beggar, it may be, or a prisoner of war. וְהָלֹךְ is followed by the inf. abs., which develops the meaning as in chap. v. 5, lviii. 6, 7.

The meaning and duration of this unclothing of himself is not learned by Isaiah until after he has acted according to the divine direction. Vers. 3, 4: "*Then said Jehovah, Even as my servant Isaiah has gone naked and barefooted, three years long a sign and type concerning Egypt and concerning Ethiopia: so will the king of Assur lead away the prisoners of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia, children and old men, naked and barefooted, and with bared seat—a shame of Egypt.*" This address of Jehovah, the word of Jehovah ביד ישעיהו, prepared for by ver. 2, took place after the lapse of three years (Cheyne), when

the fate of Ashdod was decided. The unseemly strange dress of the prophet, if he appeared through the whole three years in the exercise of his office, was a token and type (מוֹפֵת, as in Ezek. xxiv. 24) of the fall of the Egypto-Ethiopian kingdom, which occurred after the lapse of these three years. Egypt and Ethiopia were then one kingdom, so that the shame of Egypt is at the same time the shame of Ethiopia. עֶרְוָה is shameful bareness, and עֶרְוַת מִצְרַיִם is in apposition to all that precedes it in ver. 4. How prisoners are deprived of clothing and shoes is shown, for example, in 2 Chron. xxviii. 15. שֹׁת is the seat or buttocks (see Bernstein in *DMZ.* ix. 872), as in 2 Sam. x. 4, being derived from שָׁתָה, to set a nominal form, like בֵּן, עַיִן, רֵעַ, שֵׁם, with the third radical letter dropped. חֲשׂוּפֵי has the same *ay* as the words in chap. xix. 9, Judg. v. 15, Jer. xxii. 14, but they are hardly to be taken as construct forms (although ־ֵי of the construct undoubtedly has arisen from ־ַי); they are rather singular forms with a collective signification. The emendations חֲשׂוּפֵי (Olshausen, Nägelsbach) or חֲשׂוּפֵי, with the *i* of connection (Meier), are unnecessary.

If, then, Egypt and Ethiopia are so shamefully humbled, what sort of impression will that make upon those who proudly and securely trust to the great power which is supposed to be unapproachable and invincible? Vers. 5, 6: "*And they are terrified, and see themselves deceived by Ethiopia, to which they looked, and by Egypt, of which they vaunted. And the inhabitant of this coastland says on that day, Behold, thus it happens to those to whom we looked, whither we fled for help to save us from the king of Assur, and how should we, we escape?*" With תִּפְאֶרֶת, show, splendour, כָּבֹד is parallel, which is a synonym of מִבְטָח, according to which the Targum renders it. On בּוֹשׁ כֵּן compare chap. i. 29, Jer. ii. 36. The question with אֵיךְ is quite the same as in 2 Kings x. 4. אִי, which means both island and coastland, is in Zeph. ii. 5 a name of Philistia, and in chap. xxiii. 2, 6 a name of Phoenicia; and hence Knobel and others understand it here as meaning the former with inclusion of the latter. But as the Assyrians, when they marched against Egypt, had already measured themselves with the Phoenicians and Philistines, Isaiah has doubtless the Jews chiefly in his mind (Ewald, Drechsler,

Meier, Luzzatto), as Jerome already remarks: *Juda speravit in Aegyptiis et Aegyptus destruatur.* The expressions are also entirely the same as those in which we shall afterwards hear Isaiah scathing the Egyptianizing policy of Judah. However, יֹשֵׁב הָאִי הַזֶּה signifies the inhabitants of the Palestinian coast-land in general, among whom Judah is included, because it denies so untheocratically the character of the Jehovah-people. The profane designation divests the people and land of their holiness.

The conquest of Samaria falls in the first year of Sargon (722 B.C.). In the second year, according to his *Annals*, he put the Egyptian ruler (*Šilṭannu*) *Sabi* (Sevech) to flight at Raphia, and took his ally *Hanûn*, the king of Gaza, prisoner. In his eleventh year he deposed the rebellious king Azuri of Ashdod; and when the people of Ashdod expelled Aḥimit, the brother of Azuri, whom he had put in his place, and raised a certain *Jaman* to the throne, he marches against Ashdod and conquers it in the self-same year. *Jaman* fled to Egypt, to the confines of Ethiopia, but was delivered up to Sargon by the ruler of that region. The voluntary anticipative submission of the Ethiopian ruler was a commencement of what Isaiah prophesies, but the subjection of the Nile-land did not come till the time of Asarhaddon and Asurbanipal, his son, the conqueror of Thebes (Nah. iii. 8–10). The hope of Judah in Egypt turned out for Judah's destruction, as Isaiah prophesies. But the catastrophe before Jerusalem was not yet the end of Assyria. Nor did the campaigns of Sargon and Sennacherib yet bring about the end of Egypt, nor were the triumphs of Jehovah and of the prophecy concerning Assyria yet the means for the conversion of Egypt. In all this the fulfilment shows in the prophecy an element of human hope drawing the distant into immediate nearness, and this element it eliminates. For the fulfilment is divine, but the prophecy is divine and human.

The Oracle concerning the Desert of the Sea (Babylon), Chap. XXI. 1–10.

Ewald's explanation of this and similar headings is that they are additions made by the ancient readers. Even

Vitringa ascribed them at first to the collectors, though later he saw that this was inadmissible. As matter of fact, it is not possible to understand how the title מִדְבַּר־יָם could be derived from the prophecy itself, for יָם (everywhere the west) cannot mean the south (=נֶגֶב), and there is no mention of a sea in the prophecy. The heading is symbolical. The four Massas, xxi. 1–10, 11–12, 13–17, xxii., in virtue of their symbolical titles (cf. xxx. 6), as also their visionary form and the numerous points at which their contents come into contact, unite closely to form a tetralogy. The representation of the prophet as a watchman is common to the first and second Massas, while in the fourth Jerusalem is called the valley of vision, because in it is the watch-tower whence the prophet views the future destinies of Babylon, Edom, and Arabia. As in the first two Elam and Madai march against Babylon, so in the fourth (xxii. 6) do Kir and Elam against Jerusalem; even the mode of expression is strikingly similar in both (cf. xxii. 6 sq. with xxi. 7). As regards the symbolical headings, it is to be noted that Isaiah is fond of symbolical names, xxix. 1, xxx. 7, and מִדְבַּר־יָם for Babylon and its surroundings is one such. Chap. xxi. 1–10, especially in the framework of a tetralogy, impresses one strongly with the idea that it is Isaianic. This impression is so strong that Cheyne, Driver, G. A. Smith, following Kleinert's example (1877), hold that this second מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל, as distinguished from the first, xiii.–xiv. 23, is the work of the original Isaiah. This they do by referring it, not to the conquest of Babylon by the Medes and Persians under Cyrus in 538, but to the conquest of Babylon, the seat of Merodach Baladan's government, by the Assyrians under Sargon in 710 (not the first conquest in 721, but that in 710, the twelfth year of Sargon's reign, who from that time calls himself king of Babylon). Though once beaten by Sargon, Merodach Baladan had again established himself in Babylon, and, having sought helpers since his defeat, he tried not only to be the independent ruler of North and South Babylon, but also to contest with the Assyrians the position of ruler of the world. If the messengers of Merodach Baladan to Hezekiah (Isa. xxxix.) are some of the commissioners whom for the space of twelve years Merodach Baladan was constantly dispatching, the pain expressed in this prophecy

becomes all the more intelligible. The prophet is announcing the fall of that Babylon with the hope of having which for a bulwark against Assyria his people are deceiving themselves —the city of the secret confederate falls a prey to Assyria, and now Judah has to expect its vengeance. Nevertheless, I am of opinion that this historical setting of the oracle does not suffice for the purpose of retaining the Isaianic authorship. The Babylon whose fall he prophesies is the very same torment of the peoples as is mentioned in chap. xiv., the threshing-floor is the exile, and it may be asked how can Elamite and Median contingents be expected in the army of Assyria that marched against Merodach Baladan, seeing that Elam was the hereditary enemy of Assyria, and both by nature and in fact, the nearest ally of Merodach Baladan ?[1] Moreover, while in this way, on the one hand, an original composition of Isaiah is reclaimed by these three English critics from being assigned as hitherto to a later date, on the other hand the prophecy, xxxix. 6 sq., which foresees in Babylon the future mistress of the world, becomes to them unintelligible, and on this account open to suspicion.[2] Rather than pay so dearly for maintaining Isaiah's authorship in the case of xxi. 1–10, we hold that this piece is Deutero-Isaianic, but emphasize at the same time that the criticism of the Book of Isaiah, far from having attained finality, is still in constant flux.

We return to the heading. The continent on which Babylon stands is a מִדְבָּר, a great plain running south-westwards into *Arabia deserta*, and it is so broken up by the Euphrates as well as by marshes and lakes that it floats as it were in the sea. The low land on the Lower Euphrates was in a manner wrested from the sea, for before Semiramis constructed the dams the Euphrates used to overflow the whole like a sea (*πελαγίζειν*, Herod. i. 184). Abydenus even says that at first the whole of it was water, and was also called *θάλασσα* (Euseb. *Praep.* ix. 41); and the monuments call South Babylonia simply *mât tâmtim*, the sea land, and its king *šar* (*mât*) *tâmtim*, the king of the sea. The prophet's reason

[1] Schrader, *KAT*², pp. 346, 351, 353.

[2] [Professor Driver has pointed out that this is an oversight so far as he is concerned ; see his *Isaiah* in the " Men of the Bible " series, pp. 96, 127. —Tr.]

for using this roundabout name may be inferred from xiv. 23; the origin and natural features of Babylon are made into ominous prognostics of its ultimate fate. Jeremiah (li. 13, l. 38) gives the correct interpretation.

The power which first brings destruction on the city of the world, is a hostile army representing various peoples. Vers. 1, 2: "*Like storms, which sweep along in the south, it comes from the desert, from a terrible land. A hard vision is made known to me: The robber robs and the waster wasteth. Go up, Elam! Surround, Madai! I put an end to all their sighing.*" סוּפוֹת בַּנֶּגֶב (cf. xxviii. 21; Amos iii. 9) are storms which rise in the south, and therefore, in the case of Babylon, proceed out of the south or south-east, and which, like all winds coming from open steppes, are exceedingly violent (Job i. 19, xxxvii. 9, see this; Hos. xiii. 15). Accordingly it lies to hand to connect מִמִּדְבָּר with לַחֲלוֹף (Knobel, Umbreit), but the objection to this is the arrangement of the words. לַחֲלוֹף, "in the act of pressing forwards," instead of יַחֲלֹף (see Gesen. § 132, Rem. 1, and in fuller detail note on Hab. i. 17) —the *conj. periphrastica*, in order to express the violent rush associated with the onward movement—has great weight at the conclusion of the comparison. Of course the Medo-Persian army, if it advanced by the same road as did Cyrus, could not be said to come מִמִּדְבָּר. For, according to Herod. i. 189, he came over the Gyndes, and therefore descended into the Babylonian lowlands by the road described by Isidor of Charax in his *Itinerarium*,[1] *i.e.* over the Zagros pass through the Zagros gate to the upper course of the Gyndes, and along this stream which he crossed before its junction with the Tigris, through Chalonitis and Apolloniatis. If the Medo-Persian army, however, at least the Median part of it proper, descended into the lowlands of Chuzistan by following the course of the Choaspes (*Kerkha*)—the route passed over by Major Rawlinson with a Guran regiment[2]—and so advanced from the south-east against Babylon, it could be regarded in several respects as coming ממדבר, chiefly because the lowlands of Chuzistan form a broad open plain, a מדבר.

[1] See C. Masson's "Illustration of the Route from Seleucia to Apobatana, as given by Isid. of Charax," in *Asiatic Jour.* xii. 97 sqq.

[2] See Rawlinson's route in Ritter's *Erdkunde*, ix. 3 (West Asia), p. 397 sqq.

The comparison with the storms of the south seems really to presuppose that the hostile army advanced from Chuzistan, or (since it is not to be supposed that geographical distinctions are strictly observed) from the direction of the desert of *ed-Dahna*, the portion of *Arabia deserta* which bounds the lowlands of Chaldaea on the south-west. The Medo-Persian land itself is called אֶרֶץ נוֹרָאָה, because it lies outside the circle of civilised nations by which the land of Israel is surrounded. After the opening statement of his theme in ver. 1, conform to Isaianic custom, the prophet makes as it were a fresh start with ver. 2. חָזוּת has the same meaning here as in xxix. 11 (not, however, as in xxviii. 18); חָזוּת קָשָׁה is the object of the passive that follows (Gesen. § 143. 1*b*). The prophet calls the glance into the future vouchsafed him by divine inspiration קָשָׁה, hard or heavy (in the sense of *difficilis* however, not of *gravis*, כָּבֵד), on account of the repellent, hardly endurable, and so to speak hardly digestible impression which it makes on him. The contents are wide-spreading spoliation and devastation (the expression like xxxiii. 1, cf. xvi. 4, xxiv. 16: בָּגַד, *tegere*, then *tecte agere*, of faithless, deceitful, then thievish action), and summons of the peoples on the east and north of Babylonia to the conquest of Babylon (צוּרִי, *Milra*, see on li. 9); for Jehovah brings to an end (הִשְׁבַּתִּי, as in xvi. 10) all their sighing (אַנְחָתָהּ with accented *ult.*, and therefore ה *raphatum pro mappicato*, as frequently in the Book of Isaiah, see on xlv. 6; cf. 1 Sam. xx. 20; Job xxxi. 22; Hos. ii. 8), *i.e.* all the lamentation which the oppressor has wrung out on every hand (an abridgment of xiv. 3–6).

Here, as in the case of the prophecy concerning Moab, the humanity of the prophet is affected by the contents of the vision vouchsafed him; it acts on him like a horrible dream. Vers. 3, 4: "*Therefore are my loins full of cramp; pangs have taken hold of me, like the pangs of a woman in travail: I writhe so that I hear not, I am overcome with fear so that I see not. Wildly beats my heart, horror has disturbed me, the darkness of night that I love he hath turned for me into quaking.*" The prophet does not carry out into detail the description of what he sees, but we may infer how horrible it

is from the exceeding violence of the effect it produced. חַלְחָלָה is spasmodic writhing, as in Nah. ii. 11; צִירִים is properly used of birth-pangs; נַעֲוָה, to bow oneself, to bend, also used of convulsive manifestation of pain; תָּעָה (otherwise than in Ps. xcv. 10; cf., however, Ps. xxxviii. 11) is used of irregular feverish beating of the pulse. מִשְׁכַּע and מֵרָאוֹת are equivalent to negative consequential sentences as everywhere else; once only, Eccles. i. 8, does מִשְׁכַּע occur in another than a negative sense. The darkness of evening and night, which the prophet so loves (חָשַׁק, desire from inclination, 1 Kings ix. 1, 19) and, as a rule, wishes for, in order that he may give himself over to contemplation or to rest from outward and inward work, is changed for him by the frightful vision into quaking. According to Herod. i. 191, and Xenophon, *Cyrop.* vii. 23, it was during a nocturnal feast that Babylon was stormed. As in Dan. v. 30, cf. Jer. li. 39, 57, so in ver. 5 something of the kind is pointed to. *They spread the table, watch the watch, eat, drink—Arise, ye princes! anoint the shield!* This is not a scene from the hostile camp, where they are bracing themselves for the attack on Babylon, for *instruere mensam* is intended to convey the impression of a secure careless life of pleasure, and the summons "anoint the shield" (cf. Jer. li. 11) presupposes that they are not expecting to have to fight. What the prophet sees therefore is a feast in Babylon. Only one of the vividly pictorial infinitives (Ges. § 131. 4*b*), viz. צָפֹה הַצְפִּית, seems not to square with this. Hitzig's explanation, "they spread carpets out" (as in Talmud צִיפָּא, צַפְתָּא, mat, *storea*), has no support in the language of the Bible, and on this account we prefer, along with the Targum, Pesh. Jerome (LXX. does not translate the words at all), to understand the ἅπ. λεγ. צְפִית of sentinel-duty, — sentinel-duty (from צָפָה צָפָה, *speculari*) is attended to. Content with this one precaution, they all the more wildly gave themselves up to their debauch (cf. xxii. 13). The prophet mentions this matter, because it is by the sentinels that the cry, "Up, ye princes," etc., is addressed to the revellers. It was customary to oil the leather of the shields in order that it might present a shining surface and not suffer from damp, in particular, however, that blows might glance off (cf. *laeves clypeos* in Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 626). The foolish self-confidence of the

chief men of Babylon shows that they needed this summons; they think themselves so safe behind the walls and waters of the city that they have not even got their weapons ready for use.

The prophecy is now continued with כִּי; this is what is doing in Babylon, for the destruction of Babylon is decreed. This thought appears in the form of an instruction to the prophet in a vision that he should station a מְצַפֶּה on the watch-tower to look out and see what more happens. Ver. 6: "*For thus said the Lord to me: Go, place a watchman; what he sees, let him declare.*" The introduction runs as in xviii. 4, לֵךְ, as in xx. 2. Elsewhere it is the prophet himself who stands on the watch-tower (ver. 11; Hab. ii. 1 sq.); in this vision he is distinguished from the person whom he stations on the watch-tower (*specula*). The first thing that presents itself to the view of the occupant of the watch-tower is a long long procession — the army of the foe in orderly, silent, caravan-like, self-confident march. Ver. 7: "*And he saw a cavalcade, pairs of horsemen, a train of asses, a train of camels; and he listened sharply, as sharply as he could listen.*" רֶכֶב, here as in ver. 9 the leading idea, and placed accordingly, means, in general, a cavalcade, just as in Arabic ركب means a caravan mounted on camels. In front, then, there was a cavalcade of horsemen (פָּרָשִׁים from פָּרָשׁ = فارس, rider on horseback) arranged two and two—for Persians and Medes fought either on foot or on horseback (in the latter way from the time of Cyrus at least, *Cyrop.* iv. 3). Next came trains of asses and camels, a large number of which accompanied the Persian armies for various purposes. They not only carried baggage and provisions, but were also taken into battle in order to throw the enemy into confusion. Thus Cyrus carried the battle against the Lydians by means of the great number of his camels (Herod. i. 80), and Darius Hystaspis a battle against the Scythians by means of the great number of his asses (iv. 129). Some of the subjugated peoples rode on asses and camels; the Arabs in the army of Xerxes on camels, the Caramanians on asses. What the watchman sees is therefore the Persian army. But he only sees, and though

he listens, and that "listening, greatness of listening" (קָשֵׁב, as in 1 Kings xviii. 29; whereas in 2 Kings iv. 31, קָשֶׁב should be written with Abulwalîd on MS. authority), *i.e.* he strains, straining to the very utmost stretch (רב, substantive, as in lxiii. 7; Ps. cxlv. 7; and הַקְשִׁיב, in accordance with its radical idea "to stiffen," *sc.* the ear), still he hears nothing, because the long train moves on in deathly silence; at last the long train too disappears, he sees nothing and hears nothing, and impatience takes possession of him. Ver. 8: "*Then he cried with the voice of a lion,' Upon the watch-tower, O All-Lord, I stand continually by day, and at my post I keep my stand all the nights.'*" His patience fails, and he roars as if he were a lion (cf. Rev. x. 3); with a like angrily sullen voice, with a like long deep full-drawn breath, he complains to God that he has now stood so long at his post without seeing anything except that inexplicable vanished train. But just as he was about to have his say out, the complaint died away in his mouth. Ver. 9: "*And behold there came a cavalcade of men, pairs of horsemen, and began and spoke: Fallen, fallen is Babylon, and all the images of its gods he has dashed to the ground.*" It is now clear to him where the long train went to when it vanished. It has entered Babylon, has made itself master of the city, and established itself there. Now after a long time a smaller cavalcade appears to announce the news of victory, and the watchman hears them triumphantly call, "Fallen, fallen is Babylon." The subject of שָׁבַר (thus, out of pause for שִׁבֵּר, Ex. ix. 25) is Jehovah; even the heathen conquerors are compelled to acknowledge that the fall of Babylon and its פְּסִילִים (cf. Jer. li. 47, 52) is the work of the God of Israel.

The gloomy vision of the prophet is intended to comfort Israel. Ver. 10: "*O thou my threshing and child of my threshing-floor! what I have heard from Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, that I have announced to you.*" Threshing, דּוּשׁ, is a figure that expresses crushing subjugation, xli. 15, Micah iv. 12 sq., and judicial punishment, Jer. li. 33 (a parallel, which we must not allow to mislead us, seeing that Jeremiah in this case as frequently has given another turn to the Isaianic figure), or as in the passage before us disciplinary scourges, in which wrath and good intention mingle. Israel,

under the tyrannical supremacy of the world-empire, is called מְדֻשָּׁתִי (this, not מְדֻשָּׁתִי, is the reading), *i.e.* the grain which he threshes, but under limitations (xxviii. 28). It is also called בֶּן־גֹּרְנָהּ, inasmuch as it is considered fit for the threshing-floor (cf. בֶּן הַכּוֹת, one who deserves scourging, Deut. xxv. 2), and is transported thither in order after enduring punishment to come out threshed and winnowed. Babylon is the instrument employed by the divine wrath to thresh with. But love takes part also in the work of threshing, and restrains the action of wrath. A picture likely to give comfort to the grain lying for threshing on the floor, *i.e.* to the people of Israel which, mowed down as it were and removed from its native soil, had been banished to Babylon, and there subjected to a tyrannical rule,—that is what the prophet in his vision has perceived (שָׁמַעְתִּי, as in xxviii. 22).

The Oracle concerning the Silence of Death (Edom), Chap. XXI. 11, 12.

This oracle consists of a question addressed to the prophet from Seïr, and of the prophet's answer. Seïr is the hill country in the south of Palestine which was taken possession of by Edom after the expulsion of the Horites. Thus דּוּמָה of the heading cannot be any of the places of this name elsewhere with which we are acquainted. It is not the Judean דּוּמָה, Josh. xv. 52; nor the *Dûma* in the Damascene *Ġûṭa;* nor one of the *Dûmas* (*Dauma*) in the district of the Euphrates and Tigris. It is not even the *Dûma* of the Eastern Hauran, but, supposing that the word is the name of a place, the *Dûma* (Gen. xxv. 14) in the lowest district of the Syrian *Nufûd* country, the so-called جوف (Gôf). It was situated on the great Nabataean line of traffic between the northern ports of the Red Sea and 'Irâk, and was called more exactly *Dûmat el-ǰendel*, or "the rocky Dûma," because lying in a basin surrounded on every side by rugged sandstone hills.[1] This Arabian *Dûma* lies eastwards from the mountains of Seïr (now *'Serâh*), and was a settlement (*ḥaḍîra*) for a time at least loosely united with

[1] Duma itself is also called الجوف; *nufûd* are tracts of loose sandy ground. See *DMZ.* x. 828 sq., 742.

Edom. That the name of this דּוּמָה[1] should appear in the heading of the oracle, is due to the circumstance that this very name lent itself to symbolical treatment. דּוּמָה from דּוּם, to smooth, to still, is entire deep silence, and therefore the land of the dead (Ps. xciv. 17, cxv. 17). The name אדום, by the removal of the sound at the beginning to the end of the word, is made the emblem of the fate of Edom. It becomes a land of deathly silence, of deathly sleep, of deathly gloom.[2] To this the inquiry from Seïr corresponds. Ver. 11: "*A cry comes to me from Sé'îr: Watchman, how far is it in the night? Watchman, how far in the night?*" Those making this inquiry are not Israelites (Hitzig), the cry proceeds from Seïr; an oracle occupying a place between oracles concerning Babylon and Arabia, in virtue of its very position refers to the inhabitants of Seïr. Luther translates קֹרֵא rightly "they cry" (*man ruft*), for it is a participial present with a perfectly general subject (as in xxx. 24, xxxiii. 4). It is only for the purpose of bringing out to some extent the change from כְּלֵילָה to כְּלֵיל that, as regards the rest, we have departed from Luther's excellent translation. The more winged form of the second question expresses heightened anxious urgency; they would like to hear that already the night is well through, and will soon be over. כַּמָּה is used partitively (Saad.)—What part of the night is it now? Just as a sick person wishes for the end of a sleepless night, and is constantly inquiring as to the hour; so the inquiry comes to the prophet from Edom whether the night of trouble will not soon be past. It must not, however, be supposed that messengers from Edom really, as matter of fact, came to Isaiah. The event possessed only a spiritual reality. What now is the prophet's answer? He lets the inquirers see, δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, in ver. 12: "*Watchman says, Morning cometh and also night. If you will inquire, inquire! Return, come.*" The answer intentionally takes a kind of foreign

[1] The Codex of Rabbi Meir had for רומה the reading רומה (רומי), Jerus. Talm., *Taanith* i. 1 (by the people Edom was regarded as equivalent to Rome), cf. Jerome on our passage, *Quidam Hebraeorum pro Duma Romam legunt.*

[2] By Arabian poets a wilderness is mentioned, called صمت, "be silent!"

form, though Nägelsbach goes too far when he says, "the prophet mocks them with Edomitic sounds." אָתָא (with א at the end, like ܐܬܐ = *atawa*, according to another reading אָתָה, as in Deut. xxxiii. 2, Arab. اتى = *ataya*) is the Aramaic word for בּוֹא, while בָּעָה (בְּעָא) is the Aramaic word for שָׁאַל, and from בָּעִי, נְבְעִי, the fundamental form of the latter, are formed here the imperfect *tibʿāyûn* (as in xxxiii. 7) and the imperative *bᵉʿāyu*. The analogous imperative from אתה (אתי) is אֱתִיוּ; here, however, it is pointed in Syrian fashion, as in lvi. 9, 12, אֵתָיוּ. What is the meaning of the verse? Ewald (*Gram.* § 354*a*) gives וְגַם here the meaning of "and yet" (ὅμως δέ). Morning comes, and yet it remains night, inasmuch as the dawning morning will be at once swallowed up again by night. There is a difference between the cases of Edom and Israel, for the night of Israel's history has for irrevocably fixed close a promised dawn. The prophet therefore sends the inquirers home. If they wish to make further inquiries, they may do so, they may return and come. There is a significant hint in שׁוּבוּ. The prophet has a comforting answer for them only if they return, come, *i.e.* only if they come converted. So long as there is no change on them, their future is enveloped in endless night for the prophet as much as for themselves.

The Oracle in the Evening, Chap. XXI. 13–17.

The heading, when pointed מַשָּׂא בַּעְרָב, means (according to Zech. ix. 1, cf. Isa. ix. 7) oracle against Arabia. But why have we not מַשָּׂא עֶרֶב, seeing that in the three other headings the simple genitive follows משׂא? Is this the only heading of the four that is not symbolical? The object of the ב, by which it is distinguished, is almost certainly to make it symbolical. The prophet undoubtedly pronounced it בָּעֳרָב (Cheyne), and the LXX. Targum, Syr. Jerome, and Arab. thus read the second בערב, though there was no necessity for their doing so. Even without this change on בַּעְרָב the oracle begins with an evening scene, and on this ground the Massa received its symbolical title. Just as אֱדוֹם becomes דּוּמָה, because a night without a morning falls on the mountain land of Seïr, so בַּעְרָב will it soon be בָּעֳרָב, seeing that the sun of Arabia is sinking,

the darkness of evening is settling over it, and the land of the Orient is becoming a land of the Occident. Vers. 13–15: "*In the wilderness in Arabia ye must pass the night, caravans of the Dedanites. To the thirsty bring water! The inhabitants of the land of Tema come with his bread before the fugitive. For before swords they are fleeing, before a drawn sword, and before a bent bow, and before oppressive war.*" There is the less call for making any alteration on בַּיַּעַר בָּעֲרָב, that the second ב (wilderness in Arabia = of Arabia) corresponds to Isaianic usage (xxviii. 21, ix. 2, cf. 2 Sam. i. 21; Amos iii. 9). עֲרָב, عَرَب, Ezek. xxvii. 21 (in pause, עָרָב, Jer. xxv. 24), is the collective for עֲרָבִים (xiii. 20), عَرَبِيُّون, inhabitants of the ʿAraba deserticola,[1] and יַעַר is here the solitary barren wilderness as distinguished from the land covered with cities and villages. Wetzstein[2] remarks, that to say they will have to flee from the steppe into the wood would be a promise rather than a threat—a shady tree is the most delightful dream of the Beduin; in the wood he finds not only shade, but a constant supply of green pasture, and fuel for his hospitable hearth,—and so he explains it: "Ye will take refuge in the *wʿar* of Arabia," *i.e.* the open steppe will no longer afford you protection, and so you will be forced to hide yourselves in the *wʿar*. وَعْر is the name applied to the trachytic district of the Syro-Hauranitic volcanoes which is covered with a layer of stones. Undoubtedly in יער, as used here, the idea of a wilderness is more prominent than that of wood. The meaning then is: the trading caravans (אֹרְחוֹת, wandering troops, like נְדֻדוֹת, bannered troops, Cant. vi. 4) of the Dedanites journeying from east to west, probably to Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 20), whom the war in its progress from north to south has driven from the ordinary route followed by such traders, must encamp in the wilderness. The prophet,

[1] It was only at a later time that عَرَبَة, Ἀραβία, was used as the name of the deserts of the Arabian peninsula regarded as a whole. See Wetzstein, *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. vii. pp. 463–465.

[2] *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde*, 1859, p. 123.

whose sympathy in this instance mingles itself also with the revelation, asks water for the panting fugitives. הֵתָיוּ (according to the Eastern reading, הֵיתָיוּ), as in Jer. xii. 9, is the imperat. = הֵאֵתָיוּ = הֵאֶתְיוּ (Ges. § 76. 2*c*); cf. 2 Kings ii. 3, and هَاتْ, give. קִדְמוּ, which is more suited to the parallelism, is read by Targum, Ewald, Diestel; but קִדְמוּ increases the vividness of the picture. "His bread," לַחְמוֹ, refers to נֹדֵד; it is the bread which was needful for him, the fugitive, in order to save him. The request is addressed to the Temanites. It is open to discussion whether תֵּימָא (تَيْمَاء) means the trans-Hauranitic *Têmâ*, three-quarters of an hour from which there is a *Dûma*,[1] or the *Têmâ*, situated on the pilgrim-road from Damascus to Mecca between *Tebûk* and *Wâdi-el-korâ*, almost equally distant (four days) from both these places and from *Chaibar*,[2] and lying forty hours in a southerly direction from the Duma of the Syrian desert. The latter is the more probable. Just as uncertain is it whether by the caravans of the Dedanites are meant those of the so-called Cushites (Gen. x. 7), who, according to Wetzstein, lived in North-Eastern Africa, and provided for the transport of caravans between Egypt and Ethiopia on the one hand, and Syria and the Tigris-Euphrates districts on the other; or those of the Keturean Dedanites, whose name, according to Wetzstein, is preserved in that of the ruined city الديدان (*Yakût*, ii. p. 636), which he places at the eastern base of the mountains of Ḥismâ. While it seems as if Ezek. xxvii. 15, 20, xxxviii. 13 must be understood of the Cushite Dedanites, there can be no doubt that Ezek. xxv. 13, Jer. xxv. 23, xlix. 8 have in view the Keturean Dedanites, to the borders of whose district the land of Edom stretched. Our prophet also seems to refer to these. While on their way to the Euphrates regions, especially Babylon, they were driven by the bursting of the war-cloud southwards into the parched sandy desert as far as Têmâ, to which the prophet appeals on behalf of these thirsty and hungry ones for kindly and hospitable treatment. Drechsler

[1] See Wetzstein, *Reisebericht*, p. 202.

[2] See Sprenger, *Post und Reiserouten des Orients*, part i. (1864) p. 118 sq.

well remarks, How mortifying to be forced to show hospitality, that on which the Arab most prides himself, in so restricted a manner, and with such indecent secrecy! But no other course is open; for, as the four times repeated מִפְּנֵי shows, without pause the arms of the foe press forward (נְטוּשָׁה, used of the sword, and in *Sanhedrin* 95*b* of the sickle, like פְּהוּחָה, in the sense, drawn for the purpose of cutting at, Ezek. xxi. 33), and, without pause, the war, like an overwhelming Colossus, rolls on its onward way.

Thus is realized and pictured by the prophet the impending fate of Arabia, which is revealed to him in vers. 16, 17: "*For thus hath the All-Lord spoken unto me: Within a year as the years of a hireling, it is over with all the glory of Kedar. And the remnant of the number of bows of the heroes of the Kedarenes will be small, for Jehovah the God of Israel has spoken.*" Here the noun קֵדָר (Assyr. *Kidru*) is a general name for the Arabian tribes. In its narrower sense, Kedar, like the neighbouring Nebaioth, is a tribe of Ishmaelite nomads, whose camping-ground extended to the Elanite Gulf. In a year's time, calculated as exactly as is the custom between employers and employed, Kedar's freedom, military strength, numbers, and wealth (these together being its כָּבוֹד) shall have vanished. Only a small remnant is left of the brave archer sons of Kedar. They are numbered here, not by heads, but by bows, so specifying the fighting men — a mode of numbering common, for example, among the Indians of America. The noun שְׁאָר is followed here by five genitives (just as פְּרִי is by four, x. 12; see Ges. § 114. 1), and the predicate יִמְעָטוּ is in the plural because of the fulness of content of the subject. The time specified for the fulfilment of the prophecy apparently ties us down to the Assyrian period—though Wetzstein connects the oracles concerning Edom and Arabia with that concerning Babylon, the fall of which threatens Edom and the tribes of the desert with bloody subjection to the new Medo-Persian world monarchy. We have no exact information as to the fulfilment. In Herodotus (ii. 141, cf. Joseph. *Ant.* x. 1. 4) Sennacherib is called *βασιλεὺς Ἀραβίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίων*, and both Sargon and Sennacherib, in the annals of their reigns, boast of the subjugation of Arab tribes. Jeremiah, however, prophesies in the Chaldean period similar things

against Edom and against Kedar (chap. xlix., where xlix. 30 sq. is in reciprocal relation to the oracle in Isaiah). After a short glimmer of morning, night has fallen for the second time on Edom, evening for the second time on Arabia.

The Oracle concerning the Valley of Vision (Jerusalem), Chap. XXII. 1–14.

The חָזוֹת concerning Babylon, and the no less visionary prophecies concerning Edom and Arabia, are followed by a Massa, the object of which is the גֵּיא חִזָּיוֹן itself. Of course these four prophecies did not originally form a group of four as they now stand side by side. Only at a later date were they collected into such a group, and to this, notwithstanding that the cycle of prophecy in chaps. xii.–xxiii. referred to the nations of the world, was attached this prophecy against Jerusalem, resembling them as it did in having a symbolical heading, and in being of the nature of a vision. The internal arrangement of this group was not determined by the chronological sequence of composition, but by the idea of a storm advancing from the distance, and at last breaking over Jerusalem. The time of Sargon (Cheyne, Nowack) does not correspond to this, for although it is the case that Sargon calls himself once in the Nimrod inscription (Lay. xxxiii. 8) *mušaknis mât Ya-u-du* (he who has subjugated the land of Juda), still the annals of his reign are silent on the matter.[1] This being so, the occasion of the Isaianic oracle must be sought in the time of Sennacherib, at some point or other in the campaign which he entered on against Phenicia, Philistia, and Juda, 701. The mention of Jerusalem under the name גיא חזיון may cause wonder, for *αὐτὴ ὑπὲρ δύο λόφων ἀντιπρόσωπος ἔκτιστο, μέσῃ φάραγγι διῃρημένων, εἰς ἣν ἐπάλληλοι κατέληγον αἱ οἰκίαι* (Joseph. *Wars*, v. 4. 1). But it is quite in place, in so far as round Jerusalem there are mountains (Ps. cxxv. 2), and the very city, which in relation to the country occupied an elevated position, in relation to the mountains of the immediate neighbourhood appeared to stand on a low level (*πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἐχόμενα ταύτης γηλόφα χθαμαλίζεται*, as Phocas says). Because of this twofold aspect

[1] See Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons* (1889), p. xvi. sq.

Jerusalem is called (Jer. xxi. 13) the "inhabitant of the valley," and immediately on the back of this the "rock of the plain" and (Jer. xvii. 3) the "mountain in the fields," whereas (Zeph. i. 11) not all Jerusalem, but a part of it (probably the ravine of the Tyropaeum), is called מַכְתֵּשׁ, the mortar, or as we say, basin. If we add to this that Isaiah's house was situated in the lower city, and that therefore the point of view from which the epithet was applied was there, the expression is perfectly appropriate. Furthermore, the epithet is intended to be more than geographical. A valley, גַּיְא, is a lonely, quiet depression, shut in and cut off by mountains. Similarly is Jerusalem the sheltered peaceful place closed against the world, which Jehovah has chosen in order to show there to His prophets the secrets of His government of the world. On this holy city of the prophets, Jehovah's judgment is coming, and the announcement of the judgment upon it has place among the oracles concerning the nations of the world! From this we see that at the time when the prophecy was uttered, the attitude of Jerusalem was so worldly and heathenish as to call for this threat, so dark and unrelieved by any gleam of promise. Neither the prophecies dating from Ahaz's reign, however, and referring to the Assyrian age of judgment, nor those uttered in the midst of the Assyrian troubles, are at the same time so entirely without promise and so peremptory as this one. This Massa falls then in the interval, probably in the time when the people under the influence of freedom had grown light-headed, and, trusting to an alliance with Egypt, were cherishing the hope of being able to bid defiance to Assyria. The threat harmonizes with xxviii. 1–22. The prophet gives expression to the confidence of the time, and also its worthlessness, in vers. 1–3: "*What aileth thee then, that thou art wholly ascended to the house-tops? O full of uproar, thou noisy city, joyously shouting fortress, thy slain are not slain with the sword nor killed in battle. All thy chief men, making their escape together, are made prisoners without bow; all those of thee who are seized are made prisoners together, while they are fleeing far away.*" From the flat house-tops they are looking out, the whole of them at once (כֻּלָּךְ for כֻּלָּהּ, xiv. 29, 31; Ges. § 91. 1, Remark 2), eager for the fight and sure of victory, at the approaching army of the enemy.

They are so confident, cheerful, and defiant because they have no suspicion of what is threatening them. תְּשָׁאוֹת מִלְאָה is an inversion for מְלֵאַת תְּשָׁאוֹת, like אֻמְלָלָה מְנֻדָּחַת in viii. 22. עַלִּיזָה is used of self-confident rejoicing, as in Zeph. ii. 15. How terribly they deceive themselves! Not even the honour of falling on the field of battle would be theirs. Their chief men (קְצִינַיִךְ, judge, and then generally person of distinction), one and all, would depart from the city and be made prisoners outside מִקֶּשֶׁת, without the bow needing to be bent against them (מִן, as in Job xxi. 9; 2 Sam. i. 22; Ewald, § 217*b*). All, without exception, who are met with (נִמְצָאַיִךְ, as in xiii. 15) in Jerusalem by the invading foe, would, while trying to escape (*perf. de conatu*, corresponding to the classical *presens de conatu*) to a distance (see note on v. 26), be made unresisting prisoners. The conative clause cannot be translated who had fled from a distance, *i.e.* to Jerusalem, in order to find refuge there, for this thought is not evident enough to remain unexpressed. The city would be besieged (indirectly stated), and in consequence of the long siege hunger and pestilence would destroy the inhabitants, and every one who tried to reach the open would become the prize of the enemy, and, because exhausted by hunger, without venturing on resistance. The prophet on realizing the fate of the infatuated Jerusalem and Judah is seized with inconsolable anguish. Vers. 4, 5: "*Therefore I say, Look away from me that I may weep bitterly; press not on me with comfort for the destruction of the daughter of my people! For a day of uproar, and of treading down and of confusion, cometh from the All-Lord Jehovah of hosts, in the valley of vision, dashing walls into ruins, and a cry of woe is echoed from against the mountains.*" Isaiah here adopts the Kîna style, the same that we meet with later in the Lamentations of Jeremiah. This prophet uses עֶבְרָה for שֹׁד (Lam. iii. 48), and בַּת־עַמִּי is there interchanged with בַּת־יְהוּדָה and בַּת־צִיּוֹן. מֹרֶר בְּבֶכִי is more than בְּכָה מַר (xxxiii. 7); it means to give up oneself with full consent of the mind to bitter weeping, to take one's fill of weeping. The day of the divine judgment is called (ver. 5) a day in which bodies of men surge, raging through each other (מְהוּמָה), in which Jerusalem and its inhabitants are trodden down (מְבוּסָה) by enemies and thrown into wild con-

fusion (מְבוּכָה). This is one of two plays upon sounds in the passage. The other strikes on our ears like the crash of the walls overthrown by the siege-engines. כִּי קָרַקַּר קִר is to be explained as meaning he tears down walls according to Num. xxiv. 17, and like the phrases occurring in the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash, מקרקרים קירות בתיהם, they tore down the walls of their houses, and קרקר בו, to demolish a thing (see Levy, *Neuheb. Wörterbuch*, iv. 391). When that happens which is stated in ver. 5, then שַׁוְעַ אֶל־הָהָר, there sounds at the mountain a cry of woe (שַׁוְע like שָׁוְע, שָׁוְע; cf. عوث, help, cry for help), *i.e.* it strikes on the mountains surrounding Jerusalem, and returns as an echo. Against the translation, *Kir undermineth and Shoa is at the mount* (Cheyne, following Fried. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 235 sq.), is the arrangement of the words in מְקָרְקַר קִר, and the lack of clearness in שׁוע אל־ההר.

The description does not move forward step by step as would an historical narrative. Ver. 5 at once depicts the day of Jehovah in the light of its final cause and effect, and only in vers. 6 and 7 is described the advance of the besiegers, leading at last to the destruction of the walls. "*And Elam has taken the quiver together with chariots with men, horsemen, and Kir has uncovered the shield. And then it comes to pass that thy choice valleys are filled with chariots, and the horsemen firmly establish themselves in the direction of the gate.*" Of the nations in the Assyrian army there is mentioned ʿÊlam, the Semitic nation of Susiana (Chuzistân), whose original habitation is the series of valleys between the mountain chain of Zagros and the chain of outlying mountains that bound the plains of Assyria on the East. They were greatly feared as archers (Ezek. xxxii. 24; Jer. xlix. 35). Though this people appears here as a contingent of the Assyrian army, there is no instance of this in the inscriptions (*Paradies*, p. 237); but it is to be remembered that the testimonies of the inscriptions and of the Bible are mutually illustrative. קִיר also is fully proved by the Bible to have been a land under Assyrian rule (2 Kings xvi. 9; Amos i. 5, ix. 7), and yet down to the present it has not been possible to illustrate this from the inscriptions; for the tract of land through which the river Cyrus flows can surely not be meant, since

the river Kur, which joins the Araxes and debouches into the Caspian, is written with *k*, not *ḳ*. The readiness for battle, characteristic of the people of Kur, is expressed by עֶרָה כִּיגֵּן,— what Caesar (*Bell. Gall.* ii. 21) calls *scutis tegimenta detrahere*, for the Talmudic meaning *applicare* (Buxtorf, *Lex. col.* 1664) is not to be thought of. These nations, whose custom it was to fight on foot, are accompanied (בְּ, as in 1 Kings x. 2) by רֶכֶב אָדָם, chariots filled with men, *i.e.* war-chariots (as distinguished from עֲגָלוֹת), and, as is added *ἀσυνδέτως*, by פָּרָשִׁים, horsemen (*i.e.* riders trained to arms). The historical tense is introduced by וַיְהִי (ver. 7), but in a future sense. It is only for the sake of the arrangement of the words here preferred that the sentence does not proceed וּמָלְאוּ (*i.e.* vav consec.). עֲמָקֶיךָ are the valleys by which Jerusalem is encircled on the east, west, and south: the valley of Kidron on the east, the valley of Gihon on the west, the valley of Rephaim, stretching along on the right of the road to Bethlehem (xviii. 5), on the south-west, the valley of Hinnom meeting the Tyropaeum in a south-eastern corner, perhaps also the valley of Jehoshaphat, running on the upper side of the valley of Kidron in the north-east of the city. These valleys, especially the southern and finest ones, are now cut up by the wheels and hoofs of the enemies' chariots and horses, and already have the enemies' horsemen taken up position, *i.e.* firmly established themselves (שִׁית with שָׁת, to strengthen it, as in Ps. iii. 7; שִׂים, 1 Kings xx. 12; cf. 1 Sam. xv. 2) in the direction of the gate, in order that on the signal being given they may gallop at the gates and press in at them.

When Judah now, after having so long given itself up to the intoxication of hope, becomes aware that it is in extreme danger, it adopts wise measures, but without God. Vers. 8–11: "*Then does he draw away the covering of Judah, and thou lookest on that day to the store of arms of the forest-house, and the breaches of the city of David ye see, that there are many of them, and ye collect the waters of the lower pool. And the houses of Jerusalem ye count, and pull down the houses in order to fortify the wall. And a basin ye make between the two walls for the waters of the old pool; and ye do not look to Him who done it, and Him who formed it from afar ye do not regard.*"

מָסָךְ is the curtain or covering which made Judah blind to the threatening danger. Their eyes now turn first of all to the forest-house on Zion (it may have stood in the middle of the outer court of the royal palace) which had been built by Solomon for the storage and display of valuable weapons and implements (נֵשֶׁק, or, according to the Masora on Job xx. 24 and old editions, נָשֶׁק), and bore this name because it rested on four rows of cedar pillars that ran all round. They notice also in the city of David, the southern and highest part of the city of Jerusalem, how ruinous is the wall, and begin to think of repairing it. With this end in view they examine the houses of the city, in order to obtain building material for the strengthening of the walls and the repair of their breaches by pulling down buildings likely to be useful in this way and capable of being dispensed with (cf. Jer. xxxiii. 4). The compensative duplication in וַתִּתְצוּ from נָתַץ is dispensed with in spite of the inconvenient combination of sounds, תְּצ, in order that the two *t* may not coalesce into one (cf., on the other hand, תִּתֹּצוּ, Deut. vii. 5, and also תִּתְכּוּ, Ezek. xxii. 22, where the duplication remains on account of the aspirated כ). The "old pool" has hitherto been held to be the same as the upper Gihon (2 Chron. xxxii. 30) = the upper pool (vii. 3) = *Birket-el-Mamilla*, in the west of the city, the tank of the תְּעָלָה, or conduit (mentioned vii. 3), through whose artificial channel the water of the tank was carried into the interior of the city to the so-called pool of Hezekiah or the Patriarchs. This conclusion, however, is based on the identification of the upper pool (Isa. vii. 3) with the Gihon. This identification is at present rightly universally given up; for, according to 1 Kings i. 33, cf. 45 ("from the royal castle on Zion down to Gihon"), 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14, etc., the Gihon coincides rather with the present Spring of the Virgin on the eastern slope of the temple-hill. Thus, if we found on 2 Chron. xxxii. 30 (explanatory of 2 Kings xx. 20), a passage also claiming attention in connection with 9*b* and 11*a* of Isaiah's prophecy, Hezekiah's peculiar work consisted in stopping (סתם) the discharge (מוֹצָא) of the waters of the upper Gihon, *i.e.* in diverting the Gihon spring, so that it no longer appeared above ground, but sent its waters towards the west side of the southernmost part of the temple-hill, which lay

inside the city wall, through a covered subterranean rocky channel, *i.e.* through the Siloah channel, which at present opens into the Siloah basin, lying thirty metres below the level of the Spring of the Virgin. This excludes the possibility of the intention expressed in ver. 11 having anything to do with the pool of the Patriarchs (*Birket-el-Batrak*), the Amygdalon of Josephus, for during the rainy season it is served by a small conduit descending from the upper pool along the surface of the ground under the wall at or near to the Jaffa Gate. On the contrary, the "basin for the waters of the old pool" must be sought in the neighbourhood of the mouth of the Siloah channel, where also, in reality, lies the place 'between the two walls," *i.e.* between the independent ramparts of the city of David and the old city, which extended along both sides of the Tyropaeum.[1] The "old pool," which supplied the water for the new basin in the valley of the Tyropaeum, was therefore one of the several old water-basins of the Tyropaeum Valley,[2] and Hezekiah's new channel conducted the waters of this "old pool" into the new basin "between the two walls." But what is meant here by the "lower pool"? Formerly it was thought to be the *Birket-es-Sultân*, situated below the upper pool. Since, however, the Gihon lies on the east side of the city, and the bringing into use (*Anspannung*, literally "yoking," Heb. קִבִּין) of the lower pool is certainly connected with the waterworks at the end of the Siloah channel, the lower pool also must be sought in the lower part of the Tyropaeum valley. It therefore gets this name in order to distinguish it from another upper pool than that mentioned in vii. 3. It is perhaps the same as Tobler's "lower pool of Siloah," which lay close to the city wall, and is now called *Birket-el-Ḥamrâ*. In no other passage than this one do we meet with the "lower pool" under this name. The collection also of the waters of this lower pool is one of

[1] Cf. the digest of the most recent views as to the locality "between the two walls," in Bertheau-Ryssel's *Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther*, pp. 195, 206, 215.

[2] There is a basin at the mouth of an old (now blocked-up) channel, which led down from the Spring of the Virgin, *i.e.* the Gihon, on the eastern border of Ophel, and is older than the channel constructed by Hezekiah. Perhaps this channel is the pre-Hezekian Siloah (ix. 6), and this basin the "old pool;" cf. Ryssel, *loc. cit.* p. 213 sqq.

the prudent measures which will be resorted to in Jerusalem in view of the impending siege. This will happen, however, too late, and in self-reliant alienation from God, with no regard to Him who, in accordance with a plan adopted long ago before its realization, both executes and gives form to the fate which by these measures they are seeking to ward off. As in chap. liv. 5, עֹשֶׂיהָ might be plural, but the parallel יְצָרָהּ favours the singular; cf. as to the form (from עֹשִׂי = עֹשָׂה) xlii. 5, and the note on v. 12, i. 30. Here, as in xxxvii. 26 (cf. Eccles. iii. 11), we have the same doctrine of ideas as is an underlying prevailing note of the second part of Isaiah. Whatever is realized in time exists long before as a spiritual image, *i.e.* as an idea in God. God discloses it to His prophets, and prophecy in foretelling the future thereby proves that the fulfilment has been the work as also the long predetermined counsel of God. Thus in the passage before us the punishment that befalls Jerusalem is said to have been fashioned beforehand in God. Jerusalem might avert its realization by repentance, for it is not a *decretum absolutum*. As soon as Jerusalem repented, the realization would proceed no farther.

The realization, therefore, so far as it has gone, is a call by Jehovah to repentance. Vers. 12–14: "*The All-Lord Jehovah of hosts calls in that day to weeping, and to mourning, and to the pulling out of hair, and to girding with sackcloth, and behold: joy and gladness, slaughtering of oxen and killing of sheep, eating of flesh and drinking of wine, eating and drinking, for 'to-morrow we die.' And Jehovah of hosts hath revealed Himself in mine ears; Surely this iniquity shall not be expiated to you until ye die, saith the All-Lord Jehovah of hosts.*" The first antecedent condition of repentance is the feeling of pain caused by the punishments of God. In the case of Jerusalem, however, they produce the opposite effect. The more threatening the future, the more callously and madly do the people give themselves up to coarse sensual enjoyment of the present. As harmonizing with שָׂחוֹט, שָׂחוֹת, the feminine form of the infin. abs., takes the place of שָׂחֹה (for שָׂחֹה, as in vi. 9, xxx. 19, lix. 4). A similar case occurs in Hos. x. 4.[1]

[1] Similarly there stands in the Pesach-Haggada (in the prayer לְפִיכָךְ אֲנַחְנוּ חַיָּבִים) between לְבָרֵךְ and לְקַלֵּס the incorrect infin. לְעַלֹּה (to raise).

Elsewhere also, for the sake of sound-play, the author ventures what is unusual (see iv. 6, viii. 6, xvi. 9, xxxii. 7, xxxiii. 6; cf. Ezek. xliii. 11, and the *Kerî*, 2 Sam. iii. 25). Flesh and wine stand side by side, as in Prov. xxiii. 20, The absolute infinitives sketch the conduct of the revellers; their own statement of the reason for this conduct follows כִּי. What is expressed there is not a joyful welcome of death, but a love of life that scoffs at death. Then the unalterable will of the all-commanding God is announced to the prophet in a way that he can clearly understand. Such disdainful defiance of God's chastisements will not be otherwise expiated than by the death of those bidding defiance. To be covered and so to be expiated is the meaning of כֻּפַּר (from כפר, كَفَرَ, *tegere*). This is effected for sin, either by God's justice, as here, or by God's mercy (vi. 7), or by God's justice and mercy combined (xxvii. 9). In all three cases it is divine holiness that demands the expiation. This holiness requires a cover or covering between itself and the sin, in virtue of which the sin becomes as though it were not. In this particular case the act of blotting out consists in punishing. That punishment may also be called expiation is shown by Num. xxxv. 33; uncovered blood (xxvi. 21) is just unexpiated blood. So here, the sin of Jerusalem will not be expiated until the sinners meet death. The verb תָּמוּתוּן stands without qualification, and is therefore all the more dreadful (cf. *ἀποθανεῖσθε*, John viii. 21). The Targum renders: till ye die the second (eternal) death (מוֹתָא תִנְיָנָא).

So far as this prophecy holds forth the threat of Jerusalem's destruction by Assyria, it was not fulfilled. Still the prophet did not withdraw it. For, in the first place, it is a monument of divine mercy which, on the manifestation of repentance, departs from or lessens the threatened judgment. The revolt against Assyria was accomplished, but, on the part of Hezekiah and many who had taken to heart the announcement of the prophet, as an affair which had been surrendered into the hands of the God of Israel, and with regard to which nothing was hoped for from their own strength or from the help of the Egyptians. In the second place, it stands here as the announcement of a judgment which, though deferred, was not revoked. God's declared counsel remains, and the

time will come by and by when it will be realized. It remains hovering over Jerusalem like an eagle, and in the end, sure enough, Jerusalem becomes its carrion.

Against Shebna, the Steward, Chap. XXII. 15–25.

(*Appendix to the Tetralogy*, xxi.–xxii. 14.)

Shebna (שֶׁבְנָא; 2 Kings xviii. 18, 26, שֶׁבְנָה[1]) bears the official designation אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת.[2] This is the name of a high office of state in both kingdoms (1 Kings iv. 6, xviii. 3), in fact of the very highest, and it was so superior in rank to all others (xxxvi. 3, xxxvii. 2) that even the heir to the throne sometimes held it (2 Chron. xxvi. 21). The office is that of minister of the household, and resembled the Merovingian office of *major domus* (*maire du palais*). The אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת had under his care the whole domestic affairs of the king, and was, on this account, also called הַסֹּכֵן (from סָכַן, Assyr. שכן, whence *šaknu*, governor[3]), the administrator, as being the official next to him in rank. In this high office Shebna showed that he united in extraordinary degree that haughty self-security and forgetfulness of God in pursuit of enjoyment for which the people of Jerusalem had just been threatened with death (cf. chap. vii. in relation to chap. vi.; in the one a judgment of hardening is proclaimed, in the other Ahaz appears as a conspicuous example of it). He may also have been a leader of the party of notables whose sympathies lay on the side of Egypt, and so in connection with a policy foreign to the spirit of a theocracy the opponent of Isaiah in advising the king. Therefore the general content of xxii.

[1] The brother of the celebrated Hillel was so named (*Sota* 21*a*); in the full form of the name שְׁבַנְיָה (also Phoenician), which is interchangeable with שְׁכַנְיָה (*vicinus Dei*), שְׁבַן is equivalent to שָׁכֵן (constr. of שָׁכֵן), cf. Aram. שְׁבַב, שְׁכַב, *vicinus*. Nestle supposes that שכניה from שׁכן= ﻫﺐ, *donare*, *largiri*, is a synonym of נְתַנְיָה, זְבַדְיָה, and such like names.

[2] Cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22, וְאֲשֶׁר הַמֶּלֶךְ, the popular rendering of the Aramaic דְּמַלְכָּא, *βασιλικοί*.

[3] Cf. Fried. Delitzsch, § 46, p. 108.

1–14 takes the specific form of a prophecy against this Shebna. The time when this happened is the same as in xxii. 1–14. Defiance is being bidden to what is threatening, and the great dignitary not only drives about in magnificent equipages, but is engaged superintending the erection of a family tomb. Vers. 15–19 : "*Thus spake the All-Lord, Jehovah of hosts, Go, get thee unto this administrator, to Shebna the steward. What hast thou here, and whom hast thou here, that thou hewest thee out here a grave, hewing out his sepulchre on high, digging out in the rock a dwelling for himself? Behold, Jehovah hurleth thee hurling with a man's throw, and graspeth thee grasping. Clewing, he clews thee a clew, a ball into a land far and wide; there shalt thou die, and thither the chariots of thy glory, thou shame of the house of thy lord! And I thrust thee from thy post, and from thy station he pulleth thee down.*" אֶל after לְךָ־בֹא (repair to, as in Gen. xlv. 17; Ezek. iii. 4) is changed into עַל (used commonly of attack by the stronger, 1 Sam. xii. 12). The expression הַסֹּכֵן הַזֶּה points contemptuously to the subordinate though high position of the court servant. We already feel from this introduction of the divine address that ambition is a leading feature of Shebna's character. What Isaiah is to say to Shebna follows rather abruptly, but the LXX. insertion *καὶ εἰπὸν αὐτῷ* at once suggests itself. The question, What hast thou to do here, and whom hast thou to bring here? is put in view of the fate awaiting Shebna. This building of a sepulchre is useless: neither will Shebna ever lie there, nor will he be able to bury those connected with him there. The triple פֹּה is forcible in the extreme: here where he is acting as if he were at home it is not fated that he shall remain. The participles חֹצְבִי and חֹקְקִי (with *ḥireq compaginis*, see note on Ps. cxiii.) are still part of the address; the third person which comes in here is syntactically correct, although the second person is used also (xxiii. 2 sq.; Hab. ii. 15). There were rock-tombs, *i.e.* tombs in the form of rock-hewn chambers, for the reception of several bodies on the south of the valley of Hinnom, and on the western slope of the Mount of Olives, and in the north-west of the city beyond the upper pool. The קֶבֶר, however, when we keep before us the triple פֹּה and the contemptuous הַסֹּכֵן הַזֶּה, points to the city of David (1 Kings ii. 10), or

מַעֲלֵה קִבְרֵי בְנֵי־דָוִיד (2 Chron. xxxii. 33), *i.e.* the east slope of Zion, in the rock of which from the top downwards the tombs of the kings were hewn. So high a position does Shebna occupy, and so great does he think himself, that he hopes after his death to be laid to rest among kings, and by no means far down.

How he deceives himself! Jehovah throws him far away (טול, לול, to be long, Pilp. to throw or stretch far[1]), טַלְטְלָה גָּבֶר. Either this expression is equivalent to טַלְטֵלַת טַלְטֵלָה גָּבֶר, with a man's throw (Rosenmüller), or גָּבֶר is in apposition to יהוה (Gesen. Knobel): throw, a man, *i.e.* throw of a man, like מַיִם בִּרְכַּיִם, water, measure of the knees, *i.e.* reaching to the knees (cf. note, xxx. 20). The vocative rendering, "O man" (Syriac, Böttcher, Cheyne), is contrary to custom and style. Jerome gives the strange rendering, "as they carry off a cock" (תַּרְנְגוֹל=גֶּבֶר), which he had from the lips of his Hebraeus. The verb עטה means in Jer. xliii. 12 to be covered (עטא), not to roll up; in 1 Sam. xv. 19, xxv. 14, xiv. 32, to fly or rush upon anything (with בְּ, אֶל); here, like עטא, to grasp, to lay hold of (Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Knobel, and others). And as צנף means to roll into a ball or clew, צְנִיפָה, the clew or roll, so כַּדּוּר means that which Shebna becomes by being rolled up. For כ is not to be taken as the particle of comparison, כַּדּוּר, as we see from the Talmud (cf. note on Job xv. 24), being used in the sense of *globus, sphaera*, while כּוּר (cf. כּוּר) means only *gyrus, periodus.* Shebna becomes a clew, a ball, which is thrown into a land stretching far out on both sides, where with nothing to stop it it flies farther ever farther. Thither he goes to die,—the man who had degraded his own office and the Davidic court as well by an undue exercise and misuse of his power,—and with him his splendid equipages. In order to prepare for the transition to the installation of another into Shebna's office, the punishment of deprivation of his office is put at the end of the first half of the prophecy, though it cannot be otherwise conceived of than as preceding the punish-

[1] In later usage this verbal root means generally "to move on," whence מְטַלְטְלִין, movables, personal property.

ment of banishment. In 19*b* not the king (Luzzatto), but, as in 19*a*, Jehovah (cf. x. 12) is the subject. First of all, he gives him the push that makes him stagger in his place, then he pulls him completely down from this lofty station of his.

The object of this, that he may make way for a worthier man, is stated in vers. 20–24: "*And it will come to pass in that day that I call to my servant Eliakim, son of Hilkiah, and clothe him with thy robe, and with thy sash I bind him round, and thy authority I give into his hand, and he will become a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And I place the key of David upon his shoulder, and when he opens no man shuts, and when he shuts no man opens. And I strike him as a peg into a sure place, and he becomes a seat of honour to his father's house. And the whole body of* (*the members of*) *his father's house hangs on him, the descendants and the offshots, all the small vessels, from the vessels of the basins to all the vessels of the pitchers.*" Eliakim is called עַבְדִּי יְהוָה, as being the servant of God in his heart and conduct, to which official service is now first added. Usually this title of honour includes both kinds of service (xx. 3). Investiture is the means by which the transfer of office is carried through (cf. 1 Kings xix. 19). חָגַר, with the double accusative of the official girdle and the person, means here to tie firmly, to tie round (cf. חָזַק, حزق حزك), to put the girdle round him, so that the whole dress sits firmly without any looseness. From מֶמְשַׁלְתְּךָ we see how almost kingly dignity attaches to the office forfeited by Shebna. The word אָב likewise shows the same, for elsewhere it designates the king as the father of the land (ix. 5). Key means here the power of the keys, and therefore it is not placed in the hand, but on the shoulder (ix. 5) of Eliakim. It is used by the king (Rev. iii. 7), by the steward only in his stead. The power of the keys consists not merely in supervision of the royal chambers, but also in the decision as to who was and who was not to be received into the king's service. Similarly in the New Testament the keys of the kingdom of heaven are handed over to Peter. There, the mention of binding and loosing introduces a metaphor related to the other in sense; here, in פָּתַח and סָגַר, the metaphor of the key is retained. The comparison of the settlement of Eliakim in his office with

the driving in of a tent-peg was all the more readily available that יָתֵד is in general the designation of a nation's rulers (Zech. x. 4), who stand in the same relation to the community as a tent-peg to the tent which it holds firmly and keeps up. As the tent-peg is driven into the ground in such a way that a person can, if necessary, sit on it, so by development of the metaphor the peg is changed into a seat of honour. As a splendid chair adorns a room, so Eliakim graces his hitherto undistinguished family. The closely connected thought, that the members of his family in order to attain to honours would sit on this chair, is expressed by a different figure. Eliakim is once more presented to us as a יָתֵד, now, however, as a high one, somewhat like a pole on which coats are hung up, or as a peg driven into the wall at a distance from the ground. On this pole or peg they hang (תָּלוּ), *i.e.* one hangs, or there hangs כָּל כְּבוֹד, *i.e.* the whole heavy lot (as in viii. 7) of the family of Eliakim. The prophet proceeds to split up this family into its male and female components, as the juxtaposition of masc. and fem. nouns shows. The idea in צֱאָצָאִים and צְפָעוֹת (from צָפַע, by straining and pressure to bring forth and form, cf. צֵפִיעַ, dung, with צֹאָה, filth) is that of a wide-spreading and undistinguished connection. The numerous metaphorical collection of refuse is made up of nothing but vessels of a small kind (כְּלֵי הַקָּטָן, like חֵיל כָּבֵד, xxxvi. 2, צִיצַת נֹבֵל, xxviii. 4, combinations in which the genitive expresses the genus). None of them are larger than אֲגַנּוֹת (Arab. *iǵǵâna, inǵâna*, wash-hand basin), basins like those used by the priests for the blood of the sacrifices (Ex. xxiv. 6), or in a house for mixing wine (Cant. vii. 3); most of them are only נְבָלִים, leathern pitchers, earthenware bottles (xxx. 14). The whole of this large but as yet plebeian set attaches itself to Eliakim, and through him rises into distinction. At this point the prophecy that hitherto has spoken of Eliakim most respectfully suddenly assumes a tone in which there is an element of satire. We are impressed with the idea that the prophet is now dealing with nepotism, and ask ourselves, "What propriety is there in letting Shebna hear that?" Eliakim is the peg, that beginning so brilliantly comes to an ignominious end. Ver. 25: "*In that day, saith Jehovah of hosts, will the peg that is struck into a sure place give way, and*

it is knocked down and falls, and the burden that it carried perishes: for Jehovah hath spoken." In this verse the prophet does not revert to Shebna (Gesen. Ewald, Driver), he could not more clearly express the identity of the object of his threat with Eliakim (Cheyne, G. A. Smith). Eliakim also comes to ruin in the exercise of the plenary power attaching to his office by giving way to nepotism. His family makes a wrong use of him, and with an unwarrantable amount of good nature he makes a wrong use of his official position for their benefit. He therefore comes down headlong, and with him all the heavy burden which the peg sustains, *i.e.* all his relations, who, by being far too eager to make the most of their good fortune, have brought him to ruin.

Hitzig says that vers. 24 sq. are a later addition. It may be so, but it is also possible that the prophet wrote down xxii. 15–25 at one sitting, after the fate of both dignitaries, revealed to him at two different times, had found its fulfilment. We know nothing but that in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign the אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבַּיִת was no longer Shebna, but Eliakim (xxxvi. 3, 22, xxxvii. 2). Shebna, however, also fills another high office, that of סוֹפֵר. Was he really made prisoner by the Assyrians and carried away? This is conceivable even without an Assyrian captivity of the nation. Or did he prevent the threatened judgment by penitence and self-abasement? To these and other questions we have no answer.

The Oracle concerning Tyre, Chap. XXIII.

As the series of prophecies against the nations began with Babylon, so it ends with the other leading type of the pride and power of heathenism. So says Stier. Babylon is the city of the empire of the world, Tyre the city of the trade of the world; the former is the centre of the greatest land power, the latter of the greatest maritime power; the former subjugates the nations with an iron hand, and secures its rule by means of deportation; the latter carries off as peaceably as possible the treasures of the nations, and secures its interest by colonies and factories. The Phoenician cities formed at first from six to eight independent States, the government of which was

in the hands of kings. Of these Sidon was older than Tyre. The ethnological table (Gen. x.) mentions Sidon only. Tyre's celebrity dates first from the time of David. In the Assyrian era, however, Tyre had already attained to a kind of supremacy over the rest of the Phoenician cities. It lay on the coast, rather more than twenty miles from Sidon; but being hard pressed by enemies, it had transferred the real seat of its trade and wealth to a rocky island,[1] three miles farther north, and only 1200 paces from the mainland. The strait that separated this insular Tyre (*Τύρος*) from ancient Tyre (*Παλαίτυρος*) was, upon the whole, shallow, and the ship channel in the neighbourhood of the island was only about eighteen feet deep, so that a siege of insular Tyre by Alexander was carried out by the erection of a mole. Luther refers the prophecy to this attack by Alexander. But earlier than this event was the struggle of Tyre with Assyria and Babylon, and first of all the question arises, Which of these two struggles has the prophecy in view? In consequence of new disclosures, for which we are indebted to Assyriology, the question has entered a new phase. Down to the present, however, it still permits of only a hypothetical and unsatisfactory solution. The point that continues to call for the exercise of ingenuity lies in ver. 13. Let us therefore content ourselves until such time as we come to try our skill on this verse with the knowledge that it is the dominant world-power to which Tyre succumbs.

The beginning of the prophecy places before us homeward-bound Phoenician trading vessels, which are appalled by the evil tidings of their country's fate. Ver. 1: "*Mourn, ye ships of Tarshish, for it is laid waste, so that there is no house, no entrance any more! From the land of the Kittaeans it is made known to them.*" Even while at sea they hear it as a rumour from ships that meet them. For they have long and far to sail; they come from the Phoenician colony on the Spanish Baetis, the Guadalquivir, as it has been called since the days of Moorish rule. אֳנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ (cf. ii. 16) are ships that sail to Tartessus (LXX. inaccurately *πλοῖα Καρχηδόνος*). These are to howl (הֵילִילוּ, instead of the fem. as in xxxii. 11), for the hand of the devastator has been at work (*sc.* on Tyre, easily

[1] See Socin in Baedeker's *Palestina und Syrien*, 2nd ed. p. 324.

understood), and now home and city, to entering which the returning travellers were looking forward with joy, are swept away. Cyprus is the last station on this return journey. כִּתִּים are the *Κιτιεῖς*, the inhabitants of the Cyprian port *Κίτιον* and its district. Cyprus, the principal Phoenician emporium, is the last place of call. As soon as they put in here, what they had heard as a rumour on the high sea is disclosed to the crews (נִגְלָה), *i.e.* it becomes clear, undoubted certainty, for they are now told of it by eye-witnesses who have escaped hither.

What follows is addressed to the Phoenicians at home, who have the devastation before them. Vers. 2, 3: "*Be horror-struck, ye inhabitants of the coast! Sidonian merchants, sailing over the sea, replenished thee once on a time. And on great waters the seed of Shihor, the harvest of the Nile, was brought into her* (lit. *her ingathering*), *and she became gain for the nations.*" The feminine suffixes of מִלְּאָ (to fill with merchandise and riches) and תְּבוּאָה (ingathering, *i.e.* into barns and storehouses) refer to the name of the country,—אִי, applied to the Phoenician coast, including insular Tyre. Sidonian merchants are, as in Homer, Phoenician merchants in general, for the ancient and great Sidon (צִידוֹן רַבָּה, Josh. xi. 8, xix. 28) is the mother city of Phoenicia, which stamped its name on the whole people so deeply, that on coins Tyre is called אֵם צְדֹנִם. The meaning of ver. 3*a* is not that the revenue of Tyre, which was produced on the great barren sea, was like a Nile-sowing, an Egyptian harvest (Hitzig, Knobel). This would be a fine comparison; but as matter of fact the Phoenicians were in the habit of buying the corn stores of Egypt, the granary of the ancient world, and of gathering up in the warehouses of their cities what was brought in בְּמַיִם רַבִּים (on the great Mediterranean). The name שִׁחוֹר (in Dionys. Perieg. and Pliny, *Σῖρις*, the native name of the Upper Nile) means the black river (*Μέλας*, Eust. on Dion. Per. 222), the dark-grey, almost black mud of which gives such fertility to the land. קְצִיר יְאֹר is added more by way of amplification than explanation. The Nile valley was the field where this invaluable grain crop was sown and reaped, the Phoenician coast its granary. Phoenicia being thus the basis for further trade in grain and other articles of commerce, became a gain (const. of סַחַר, meaning the same as in ver. 18, xlv. 14; Prov. iii. 14, xxxi. 18), *i.e.* a

means of gain, a source of profit and subsistence for many entire peoples. Others translate the word "emporium," but סָחַר has not this meaning. Moreover, foreigners did not come to Phoenicia, but the Phoenicians went to them (Luzzatto).

From addressing the whole coast land, the prophet now turns to address the ancestral city. Ver. 4: "*Tremble, O Sidon, for the sea speaketh, even the stronghold of the sea; I have not travailed nor brought forth, and have not reared young men, brought up virgins.*" The sea, not this itself (Nägelsbach), but more specifically the stronghold of the sea (מָעוֹז, with unchangeable pretonic vowel, like מָגֵן, מָסָךְ), *i.e.* the rocky island on which New Tyre, with its lofty strong dwelling-houses, stores, and temples stood, lifts up its voice in lamentation. Sidon, the ancestress of Canaan, must hear what cannot but cover her with shame,—the lament of her own daughter Tyre, that robbed as she is of her children, she is like a barren woman. Because her young men and virgins have been done to death by war, she is in the very same case as if she had never brought forth or reared them (cf. i. 2). The fate of Phoenicia causes dismay even in Egypt. Ver. 5: "*When the report comes to Egypt, they writhe at the report of Tyre.*" The expression למצרים in 5*a* requires us to supply in thought a verb, יָבֹא (cf. xxvi. 9); the כְּ in 5*b* means "at the same time as," "simultaneously with," as in xviii. 4, xxx. 19 (Gesen. *Thesaurus*, p. 650). In 5*a* the report is not defined, in 5*b* it is specially referred to the fall of Tyre. The genitive after שֵׁמַע and שְׁמוּעָה (*e.g.* 2 Sam. iv. 4) is almost always (except in liii. 1) the genitive of the object. Then anxiety and horror lay hold of the Egyptians, because along with Tyre, to which they sold their grain, their own prosperity is ruined, and a similar fate awaits themselves, now that such a bulwark is fallen. יָחִילוּ is the imperfect Kal of חָלָה in ver. 4.

The inhabitants of Tyre, however, who wish to avoid death or deportation, must make their escape to the colonies, the more distant the better; not to Cyprus, nor to Carthage (as when Alexander attacked insular Tyre), but to Tartessus, the farthest west and most difficult to reach. Vers. 6–9: "*Pass ye over to Tarshish; mourn, ye inhabitants of the coast! Fareth it thus with you, O joyous one, whose origin is of ancient days, whom her feet carried afar off to settle? Who hath determined*

such a thing concerning Tyre, the giver of crowns, whose merchants are princes, whose traders are the honourable of the earth? Jehovah of hosts hath determined it, to desecrate the magnificence of every ornament, to disgrace all the honourable of the earth." The call הֵילִילוּ implies that they had a right to give themselves up to their grief. Elsewhere complaint is unmanly, but here (cf. xv. 4) it is justifiable. In 7*a* it is doubtful whether עַלִּיזָה is a nominative of predication, as it is explained by most ("Is this, this deserted heap of ruins, your formerly so joyous one?"), or a vocative. We prefer the latter, because in this case the omission of the article is not strange (xxii. 2; Ewald, 327*a*); whereas in the other case, although the omission is possible (see xxxii. 13), it is harsh (cf. xiv. 16). To עַלִּיזָה attaches itself the descriptive attributive sentence—the beginning of whose existence (קַדְמָה, Ezek. xvi. 55) dates from the days of olden time—and also a second—whose feet carried her far away (רַגְלֶיהָ, masc., as *e.g.* in Jer. xiii. 16) to dwell in foreign parts. Deportation by force into the land of the enemy is not intended. Luzzatto rightly remarks against such a view, that יִבְלוּהָ רַגְלֶיהָ is the very strongest expression for voluntary migration, with which also לָגוּר agrees, and also that this interpretation makes us feel the want of an antithetical וְעַתָּה. What the words refer to are the trading journeys (whether by sea or land) to a distance (see as to מֵרָחוֹק, note on xvii. 13) and the colonies, *i.e.* settlements abroad (for which גּוּר is the most suitable word). This fundamental characteristic of the Tyro-Phoenician people is expressed by יְכִילוּהָ, *quam portabant.* Sidon is no doubt older than Tyre, but Tyre is also ancient. It is called by Strabo the oldest Phoenician city after Sidon (*μετὰ Σιδῶνα*); by Curtius, *vetustate originis insignis;* while Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 3. 1; cf. Herod. ii. 44) estimates the interval between the foundation of Tyre and the building of Solomon's temple at 240 years. Tyre is called הַמַּעֲטִירָה, not as wearing a crown (Jerome: *quondam coronata*), but as conferring crowns (Targum). As matter of fact, both meanings are suitable; but the latter answers better to the Hiphil (since הִכְרִין, הִפְרִיס, which expresses production from within, cannot be brought into comparison). In the colonies, such as Kition, Tartessus, and at first Carthage, the government was in the hands of kings, appointed by, but independent of, the mother city. Her mer-

chants were princes (cf. x. 8), the most honoured ones of the earth. נִכְבְּדֵי acquires a superlative force from standing in the genitive. Because the Phoenicians had the commerce of the world in their hands, a merchant was called simply כְּנַעֲנִי, the merchandise כְּנַעֲה. The plural formation כְּנַעֲיָה corresponds to the sense in which it is intended the word should be taken (that of a common noun), her merchants. The question, ver. 8, serves only to give prominence to what the answer, ver. 9, states. גְּאוֹן כָּל־צְבִי, like עֲלִיָּה, has an Isaianic ring. The verb חִלֵּל, to desecrate, causes us, on the mention of "magnificence of every ornament," to think specially of the holy places of continental and insular Tyre, among which the temple of Melkart, in insular Tyre, was celebrated on account of its great antiquity (cf. Arrian, *Anab.* ii. 16: *παλαιότατον ων μνήμη ἀνθρωπίνη διασώζεται*). These glories, which were supposed to be inviolable, Jehovah profanes. לְחַלֵּל, *ad ignominiam deducere* (Jerome), as in viii. 23.

The consequence of the fall of Tyre is that the colonies, of which Tartessus is mentioned by way of example, achieve their independence. Ver. 10: "*Overflow thy land like the Nile, O daughter of Tarshish! No girdle confines thee any more.*" The girdle, מֵזַח, is the supremacy of Tyre, which has hitherto restrained all independent action on the part of the colony. Now they no longer need to wait in the harbour for the ships of the mother city, no longer need as her bond-servants to dig in the mines for silver and other metals; they have full and free possession of the colony's territory, and can freely spread themselves over it, like the Nile, when, leaving its bed, it overflows the land.

The prophet next relates, as if to the Phoenicio-Spanish colony, the daughter, *i.e.* the population of Tartessus, what has befallen the mother-country. Vers. 11, 12: "*His hand hath He stretched over the sea, thrown kingdoms into trembling; Jehovah hath given command concerning Canaan, to destroy her fortresses. And He said, Thou shalt not rejoice any longer, thou dishonoured one, virgin daughter of Sidon! Set out for Kittim, pass over; there also thou wilt not find rest.*" Jehovah has stretched His hand over the sea (Ex. xiv. 21), in and on which Tyre and its colonies lie; He has thrown into a state of anxious excitement the countries of anterior

Asia and the Egypto-Ethiopian quarter, and with regard to Canaan (אֶל, like עַל, Esth. iv. 5) has commissioned instruments of destruction. The Phoenicians themselves called their country כְּנַעַן, but in the Old Testament the name occurs in this most restricted application only here. לַשְׁמִיד for לְהַשְׁמִיד is the same syncope as in iii. 8 (cf. i. 12); Num. v. 22; Amos viii. 4; Jer. xxxvii. 12, xxxix. 7. The form מָעֻזֶיהָ (Babyl. מעזניה) is stranger, but it is not amorphous (Knobel, Meier, Olshausen, Nägelsbach); there are other examples of this way of resolving duplication and transposition of letters (it stands for מָעֲנֶזֶיהָ), viz. תַּמְנוּ, Lam. iii. 22, cf. on Ps. lxiv. 7, and, at least according to Jewish grammarians (see, however, Ewald, § 250*b*), קָבְנוּ, Num. xxiii. 13.[1] "Virgin of the daughter of Sidon," equivalent to virgin daughter of Sidon (two epexegetical genitives, Ewald, § 289*e*), is synonymous with כְּנַעַן. The name of the ancestral city (cf. xxxvii. 22) has here become the name of the whole people that has sprung from it. Hitherto this people was untouched, like a virgin; now it resembles one who has been ravished and overpowered. If, now, they flee over to Cyprus (כִּתִּים; according to the Oriental reading, כתיים, *Kethîb*; כִּתִּים, *Kerî*), there will be no rest for them even there; because the colony, emancipated from the Phoenician yoke, will be glad to rid itself also of the unwelcome guests from the despotic mother-country.

The prophet proceeds, vers. 13, 14, to relate the fate of Phoenicia: "*Behold the land of the Chaldeans, this people that has not been* (*Assyria—it hath prepared the same for desert beasts*) — *they set up their siege-towers, destroy the palaces of Canaan, make it a heap of ruins. Mourn, ye ships of Tarshish, for your fortress is laid waste.*" So taken, the text which has been handed down says that the Chaldeans have destroyed Canaan, in fact Tyre. הֵקִימוּ is to be referred to the plural idea, and בָּחוּנָיו (*Kethîb*, בַּחֻינָיו) to the singular idea in זֶה הָעָם; the feminine suffixes, on the other hand, to Tyre,—

[1] Perhaps, however, the נ is part of the suffix, and the form an intentional imitation of Phoenician, like עזרנם, their helper, אבנם, their father, and like the dialectic שְׁמִי=שְׁמֵנִי (my name), *Chullin* 51*a*, *Erubin* 64*b*. Reifmann in *Maggid*, p. 350, compares עזניה, Lev. xv. 13 = עוֹן, *Kelim*, xvii. 15. The conjecture of Abramsohn, כָּעוֹז נֶזֶיהָ (מָעוֹז), couples two indisparate words.

they (the Chaldeans) have laid bare the palaces (אַרְמְנוֹת from אַרְמוֹן) of Tyre, *i.e.* have pulled or burned them down (עוֹרֵר, here not from עוּר, but from עָרַר = עָרָה, Ps. cxxxvii. 7, like עָרְעֵר, Jer. li. 58) to the foundations, it (the Chaldean people) has made her (Tyre) a rubbish-heap. If this were all, the text would be clear and free from difficulty. But in the group of words אַשּׁוּר יְסָדָהּ לְצִיִּים is Assyria subject or object? If the former, the prophet, in order to describe the instruments of divine wrath, points to the land of the Chaldeans, calls them a people לֹא הָיָה, which up to this point has not been, and explains this by the statement that Assyria at the first laid for them, the wild hordes (Ps. lxxii. 9), the foundations of the land which they (the Chaldeans) at present inhabit, or better (seeing that צִיִּים can hardly be supposed to mean mountain hordes), that Assyria appointed it (this people, עָם, fem. as at Jer. viii. 5; Ex. v. 16) inhabitants of the steppe (so Knobel). This can convey only the idea that Assyria settled the Chaldeans, whose place of abode was among the mountains of the north, in the land now bearing the name of Chaldea, and so made the Chaldeans a people, *i.e.* a settled civilised people, and a people by conquest playing a part in the history of the world (at first, according to Knobel, as a part of the Assyrian army). But that the Assyrians brought down the Chaldeans from the mountains to the lowlands (Calvin), and that about the time of Shalmaneser (Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, Segond, and others), is an unhistorical, untenable hypothesis, nothing but an inference from this passage. On this account I have tried in my *Commentary on Habakkuk*, p. xxii., to give another meaning to אַשּׁוּר יְסָדָהּ לְצִיִּים: Assyria, *i.e.* Nineve—it has assigned the same to the desert beasts. For the transference of the name of the country to the chief city there are many examples, as *Sham* = Damascus, *Misr* = Cairo (*Zeitschrift deut. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xxxix. 341): צִיִּים is commonly used of beasts of the desert, *e.g.* xiii. 21, and יָסַד לְצִיִּים may be explained in accordance with Ps. civ. 8 (cf. Mal. i. 3, שָׂם לְתַנּוֹת, to make over to the jackals); while the form of the parenthetical sentence would be like that of the concluding sentence of Amos i. 11. This passage, however, would be the only one where Isaiah prophesies, and that only in passing, how the transition from an Assyrian to a Chaldean world-empire will

come about; the drawing of this connecting-line is the business of Nahum and Zephaniah. For this reason Cheyne, Driver, and others, as already Riehm, refer 13*a* to the subjugation of the land of the Chaldeans by Assyria. This leaves us a choice. We may think either of the conquest of Babylon (Babel) by Sargon in 709, or by Sennacherib in 703, and again in 696/5. The translation would run, See the land of the Chaldeans, this people is no more; Assyria has assigned it to the desert beasts. We would then need to refer יְסָדָהּ to Babylon (Babel), which is not mentioned; since, however, of course, conquest of Babylon (Babel) and devastation of Babylonia do not coincide, and since "the Assyrians" is the subject of הקימו, we must suppose that הן points to their irresistibility as proved in the case of Babylon (Babel). This is so forced, so unprepared for, so destructive of the unity of the prophecy, that my own translation, given above, according to which the land of the Chaldeans is the population of Chaldea and Assyria is the city of Nineveh, which had been reduced to ruins by them, appears in comparison much more natural, although it does not admit of our maintaining Isaiah's authorship. Ewald's and Schrader's conjecture, that the text originally ran הֵן אֶרֶץ כְּנַעֲנִים is still the best way of escape. The first sentence read thus runs: See the land of the Canaanites, this people has perished (literally, has come to nothing), Assyria has prepared it (their land) for the desert beasts. לֹא הָיָה, it is true, usually means, not to be in existence (Obad. ver. 16), not to have been, but since לֹא is used with a slightly substantive force (cf. Jer. xxxiii. 25), it has also the sense to come, or to have come to nothing, Job vi. 21, Ezek. xxi. 32, and perhaps also Isa. xv. 6. By this alteration of הכשׂדים into הכנענים all objections to Isaiah's authorship are removed. But the traditional text as it runs makes it necessary for us to suppose that a later prophet was the author. As the destroyers of the palaces of Tyre he names the Chaldeans—this people which hitherto, notwithstanding its great antiquity (Jer. v. 15), has not distinguished itself as a conqueror of the world (cf. Hab. i. 6), but was subject to the Assyrians, which now, however, after it has destroyed Assyria, *i.e.* Nineveh, has risen to power. The summons to lamentation addressed to the ships of Tarshish (ver. 14) brings the prophecy back to its starting-

point (ver. 1). The fortress is here, as ver. 4 shows, insular Tyre.

Since in this way the prophecy is a completely closed circle, vers. 15–18 may appear to be a later addition. Here the prophet announces that Tyre will once more rise to prominence. Vers. 15, 16: "*And it will come to pass in that day that Tyre will be forgotten seventy years like the days of one king — after the expiry of the seventy years it will fare with Tyre according to the song of the harlot: 'Take the lute, roam through the city, O forgotten harlot. Play bravely, sing zealously, that thou mayest be remembered.'*" The days of one king are a period that is characterized throughout by sameness and absence of change; for, especially in the East, all circumstances are then determined by one sovereign will, and so stereotyped. The seventy years are compared to the days of one king in this sense. In itself seventy is a suitable number to designate such a uniform period, for it is 10 multiplied by 7, and so a completed series of heptads of years שַׁבָּתוֹת. If a Deutero-Isaiah is taken to be the author, we will have to understand by the seventy years the seventy years of Chaldean rule, Jer. xxv. 11 sq., cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21. During these Tyre has against its will to give up the traffic which hitherto had been carried on over the whole world. וְנֵעֻתָּה is not the perfect consec. (for וְנֶעְתָּה) with the original fem. termination ת, which occurs only in the case of verbs ל״א and ל״ה, vii. 14, Ps. cxviii. 23, but the participle following the same syntax as in Ps. lxxv. 4, Prov. xxix. 9, Lat. *oblivioni traditâ Tyro . . . eveniet Tyro.* After the seventy years the harlot once more finds acceptance. It fares with her as with an alma or bayadère, who moves through the streets singing and playing, and so draws attention again to her charms. The prophecy at this point passes into the strain of a street song. As in the popular song it fares with such a common musician and dancer, so fares it with Tyre. Then, when it begins again to play the harlot with all the world, it will get rich again from the profit of such traffic with the world. Ver. 17: "*And it will come to pass at the end of seventy years, Jehovah will visit Tyre, and she comes again to the wages of prostitution, and plays the harlot with all kingdoms of the earth on the broad face of the earth.*" In so far

as commercial activity, thinking only of earthly advantage, does not recognise a God-appointed limit, and carries on a promiscuous traffic with all the world, it is called זְנוּת, as being a prostitution of the soul; and, moreover, at markets and fairs, especially Phoenician ones, prostitution of the body was an old custom. For this reason the trades-profits now once more enjoyed by Tyre are called אֶתְנָן (Deut. xxiii. 19). The fem. suffix to this word, according to the Masora, has no *Mappik*, whereas the same authority writes in ver. 18 ואתנתה. Here וְשָׁבָה is Milra; in vi. 13, on the other hand, Milel; this is an inconsistency in punctuation (cf. on xi. 2).

This resuscitation of the trade of Tyre is called a visitation of Jehovah; for however worldly the activity of Tyre is, the end which Jehovah makes it serve is a holy one, though it is true this does not hallow it. Ver. 18: "*And her gain and her wages of prostitution become holy unto Jehovah; it is not stored up and not gathered, but theirs who dwell before Jehovah will be her gain from trade, to eat their fill, and for splendid clothing.*" In this passage סַחַר (it was not necessary to assume another form, סָחָר, for ver. 3), being used side by side with אתנן, is the business itself which yields the profit. This, as well as the profit made, becomes holy unto Jehovah. The latter is not, as previously, treasured up (יֵאָצֵר) and stored (יֵחָסֵן from חָסַן = خزن, whence magazine = store-place), but they give tribute and presents from it to Israel, and contribute to maintain in abundance, and to clothe with splendid garments (מְכִסֶּה, what covers = covering, and עָתִיק, like Arab. عتيق, old, time-honoured, noble, from עָתַק, *provehi*, of time, place, and rank), the people that dwell before Jehovah, *i.e.* whose proper dwelling-place is in the temple before the divine presence (Ps. xxvii. 4, lxxxiv. 5). A strange prospect! *Haec secundum historiam necdum facta comperimus*, says Jerome.

We return now to the question whether the prophet points to the Assyrians or the Chaldeans being the destroyers of Tyre. Shalmaneser IV., concerning whom there are no cuneiform records, had to do with Tyre; we are informed of this by the excerpt from the chronicle of Menander, preserved in Josephus, *Ant.* ix. 14. 2. Elulaeus, king of Tyre, had

once more brought the Cyprians (*Κιτταῖοι*) into subjection. In order to recover Cyprus, the king of Assyria made war on Phoenicia, but a general peace soon put an end to this campaign. Thereupon Sidon, Arke, Old Tyre, and many other cities deserted Tyre (insular Tyre) by placing themselves under the supremacy of Assyria. As the Tyrians did not do this, Shalmaneser renewed the war, and the Phoenicians subject to him supplied him with sixty ships and eight hundred rowers for this purpose. The Tyrians fell upon these with twelve ships, scattered the hostile vessels, and took about five hundred prisoners. By this the reputation of Tyre was much increased. The king of Assyria had to content himself with leaving guards on the river (Leontes) and the conduits in order to cut off the supply of fresh water from the Tyrians. This lasted five years, during which time the Tyrians obtained water by digging wells. We have information in at least one cuneiform inscription as to the relation in which Sargon, Shalmaneser's successor, stood: he punished the Ionians, and procured rest (*ušapšihu*) for the city of Tyre (*ʿir Ṣurri*) from these dreaded pirates.[1] From this we may infer that the relation was a friendly one, indeed, one of vassalage. Under Sennacherib, Tyre tried to become more independent. It is not named among the cities of Phoenicia which Sennacherib boasts he conquered in his third campaign.[2] Nebuchadnezzar's expedition against Tyre also was not crowned with success. Josephus knows (*Ant.* x. 11. 1) from the Indian and Phoenician histories of Philostratus only that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Tyre thirteen years while Ithobaal was king. He also reports (*c. Ap.* i. 21) from a Phoenician source that Nebuchadnezzar (from the seventh year of his reign onwards) for thirteen years besieged Tyre under Ithobaal, and the history of the Tyrian reigns which follows this leads us to suppose that previous to the Persian period the Tyrians were dependants of Chaldea, for twice they got their king from Babylon. Phoenicia (whether including insular Tyre or not, we do not know) became a satrapy of the Chaldean empire (Joseph. *Ant.* x. 11. 1; *c. Ap.* i. 19, from Berosus), and was so still towards the end of the Chaldean rule. Berosus says expressly, that Nebuchad-

[1] Schrader, *KAT*², p. 169. [2] *Assyrische Lesestücke*³, p. xii. sq.

nezzar again suppressed the revolt which had broken out in Phoenicia and returned to Babylon, whither he had been recalled by the death of his father, with Phoenician captives. What we fail to find, however, is information as to an actual conquest of Tyre by the Chaldeans. Neither Josephus nor Jerome was able to produce such a thing. The following word of Jehovah was addressed to Ezekiel (xxix. 17 sq.) in the twenty-seventh year of the deportation under Jehoiachin (the sixteenth after the destruction of Jerusalem): "Son of man! Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, has made his army perform a long and grievous service against Tyre: every head has lost its hair, every shoulder is skinned without himself and his army obtaining any recompense from Tyre for the grievous service which they have endured on account of it." Then it is added that Jehovah will give up Egypt to Nebuchadnezzar, and that this will be his army's recompense. Hengstenberg (*de rebus Tyriorum*, 1832), Hävernick, Drechsler, and others are of opinion that this passage presupposes the conquest of Tyre, and only declares the disproportion between the profit which Nebuchadnezzar derived from it and the exertions which it cost him. So Jerome before them (on Ezek. *loc. cit.*): At the time when the army of Nebuchadnezzar with immense exertion had secured access for themselves to insular Tyre by throwing up a mole, and were able to make use of their siege-engines, the Tyrians had already shipped off all their riches to the islands, *ita ut capta urbe nihil dignum labore suo inveniret Nabuchodonosor, et quia Dei in hac parte obedierat voluntati, post aliquot captivitatis annos Tyriae datur ei Aegyptus.* It is, however, surely far likelier that he did not succeed in conquering Tyre (Gesen. Hitzig, Grote, and others), not even in compelling it to capitulate (Winer, Movers, Kuenen); for this last would surely have brought him gain, and would itself have been of this nature. All our authorities speak only of a subjugation of Phoenicia, but not of Tyre; all that can be adduced in support of the vassal-relation of the latter to the great king of the Babylonian empire is that one statement of the Phoenician authorities, that the Tyrians obtained from Babylon (ἀποστείλαντες μετεπέμψαντο ἐκ τῆς Βαβυλῶνος) two of their rulers, Merbal and Eirom; but it has no evidential value.

But even assuming that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Tyre, it is still the case that he did not destroy it, as we are led to expect from the words of the two prophecies. The true solution lies in the character of all prophetic vision into the distant future. In the view of the prophet, all the destruction by which at last the downfall of Tyre was completed moves forward in company with the impending humiliation and subjugation of the Phoenician mother-country by Assyria and Babylon. Even Alexander did not destroy Tyre, at least insular Tyre, when, after seven months' exertions, he conquered it. Under Syrian, and later, under Roman supremacy, Tyre still was an important and flourishing commercial city. At the time of the Crusades it was so still, and even the Crusaders who conquered it in 1124 did not destroy it. Only one hundred and fifty years later did the work of destruction begin with the removal of the fortifications by the Saracens. At present all the glory of Tyre is either sunk in the sea or buried under drifted sand—an inexhaustible mine of building material for Beyrout and other coast towns. On this large ruin-covered spot, once occupied by the island city, at the north-west corner of the island, there stands the present Tyre (*Sûr*), a miserable decaying little place. The island is an island no longer. Alexander's mole, through the washing up of sand, has become a pretty broad neck of land, and connects the island with the shore. This picture of destruction meets the prophet's outlook into the distance; but the interval of two thousand years being so much compressed that the whole appears continuous, the place it occupies is close on the back of the attack by the Chaldeans on Tyre. The law by which prophecy is governed all through is the well-known one of perspective. Prophecy itself cannot have been ignorant of this law, for it needed it in order to vindicate itself in its own eyes. Still greater need had posterity, in order not to be led astray by prophecy, to know about this law, which, everywhere governing it, combines human limitation and divine vision in such a way that, while the former retains its place and power, the latter perceives things, not under the form of time, but in a sort of eternity.

But one other enigma presents itself. The prophet announces that after seventy years Tyre will once more rise

to a high position, and that its world-wide trade will be transferred to the service of the community of Jehovah. As matter of fact, the Tyre that did rise to note again in post-Chaldean times, especially after the capture by Alexander the Great in 333 B.C., had no political importance, but was only a great emporium. *Tyrus olim clara*—says Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* v. 17—*nunc omnis ejus nobilitas conchylio atque purpura constat.* Moreover, in post-Chaldean times events also occurred that were preludes to the fulfilment of this prophecy. In accordance with the command of Cyrus, Sidonians and Tyrians assisted in the building of the temple in Jerusalem (Ezra iii. 7, cf. i. 4), and at the very beginning of the apostles' labours there existed in Tyre a Christian community, which was visited by Paul (Acts xxi. 3 sq.), and thenceforth continued to grow steadily. Is it not, however, Christian Tyre which is lying in ruins? One of the most noteworthy ruins is the magnificent cathedral of Tyre, for the consecration of which Eusebius of Caesarea composed an address. Down to the present, then, there have indeed been preludes in which there are features belonging to the fulfilment of the prophecy; but the real fulfilment has apparently become impossible. Whether the prophecy will in the end be fulfilled only ideally, *i.e.* in so far as along with the kingdoms of the world its commerce also becomes God's and His Son's, or πνευματικῶς in the sense in which this word is used in the Apocalypse, *i.e.* by the reproduction in another city of the essential nature of old Tyre, just as Rome was a reproduction of Babylon in this respect, or *in propria persona, i.e.* by the disappearance of the present miserable *Sur* before a Tyre that rises again from its ruins,—this no expositor, who is not himself a prophet, is able to say.

PART IV.—FINALE OF THE GREAT CATASTROPHE, CHAPS. XXIV.-XXVII.

The cycle of prophecy that begins here finds a counterpart in the Old Testament only perhaps in Zech. ix.–xiv. Both these sections are eschatological and apocalyptic in content.

Even so, they start from apparently sharply-defined historical circumstances, which, however, like will-o'-the-wisps, elude any attempt at following out and grasping them. The particular reason for this is that the root of the idea in the circumstances being laid hold of, they are lifted forward out of the sphere of mere history and made symbols of things in the far-distant final future. It is not matter for wonder, therefore, that in the case of these chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.) Isaiah's authorship has been denied since the time of Eichhorn and Koppe, notwithstanding the fact that, so far as the mere words are concerned, they contain nothing later than the Assyrian period. This was done by Rosenmüller in the first edition of his Scholia, but in the second and third editions he again deviated from this view, mainly because the prophecy nowhere passes beyond the political horizon of Isaiah's own time. We cannot allow any weight to the reason mentioned for the genuineness; it is the light thrown by it which we compared to a will-o'-the-wisp. As a consequence, too, of following this light, however, critics in the course of their search after another historical basis for this cycle of prophecy to take the place of that offered in Isaiah's own times, are involved in contradictions. According to some, the author wrote in Babylon; according to others, in Judah: according to some, towards the end of the exile; according to others, as early as the fall of the kingdom of Judah. Hitzig holds that the city of the world (*Weltstadt*) whose destruction is prophesied is Nineveh; most others, that it is Babylon. Only Egypt and Assyria are mentioned by the prophet as powers that enslave Israel, and so Knobel is led to think that he is speaking figuratively for fear of the enemies still dwelling in Judah. All attempts to settle the historical circumstances break down, because everything that seems to belong to this or that historical period is only eschatological symbol. There is no way of determining whether what reads as history belongs to the present or the past of the prophet; his stand is taken in advance of the farthest point as yet reached by history in its course. These chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.), joined on as they are to chaps. xiii.–xxiii. without any heading, demand that they should be viewed as connected with the oracles concerning the nations in a relation of continuous progress, and this relation is

supported by retrospective allusions, and the fact that Jeremiah (cf. xxiv. 17 sq. with Jer. xlviii. 43 sq.) seems to have read these chapters and xiii.–xxiii. together.[1] The particular judgments prophesied in the oracles against the nations run out into this final judgment as into a sea, and all the salvation that encircles with a halo of radiance the oracles against the nations concentrates here its light and warmth. Chapters xxiv.–xxvii. are the *finale* to chaps. xiii.–xxiii., and that in the strictest sense of the word. This concluding cycle performs the same function as the *finale* in musical compositions, —it gathers into one grand impressive whole the previously scattered themes. It is also, however, in reality full of music and song. The description of the catastrophe in chap. xxiv. is followed by an echo in the simple form of a hymn. As the book of Immanuel (chaps. vii.–xii.) concludes with a psalm of the redeemed, so here there rise the strains of a fourfold song of praise. It celebrates the overthrow of the city of the world (xxv. 1, 2), the appearing and beatific presence of Jehovah (xxv. 9), the restoration and resurrection of Israel (xxvi. 1–19), the vineyard of the community bringing forth fruit under Jehovah's protection (xxvii. 2–5). This song, too, assumes every form from the most sublime hymn to the most ordinary kind of popular ditty. It is a great and varied concert to which we are listening, opened and closed only as it were with the epic beginning chap. xxiv., and the epic conclusion chap. xxvii. 6 sqq., and interspersed with sort of recitative pieces in which the thread of prophecy is carried forward. Nowhere, too, do we find so much music in the very sound of the words. This entire *finale* is a great Hallelujah to chaps. xiii.–xxiii., hymnlike in content, musical in form. The form does not make us hesitate to attribute it to Isaiah; even Driver notes verses and groups of verses quite Isaianic in style, and admits the type to be fundamentally Isaianic and non-Jeremianic. But this cannot be denied :— the contents, in order to find a place in the development of the Old Testament knowledge of salvation, must be referred to post-Isaianic times. The author is not Isaiah himself, but a disciple of Isaiah's who in this case surpasses his master. Isaiah is great in himself, greater still in his disciples, as

[1] See the closing remarks, Drechsler's *Isaiah*, iii. 405 sq., cf. 399 sq.

rivers are greater than the source whence they issue. It must, however, always appear strange, that tradition has been so careless as to let the name of a prophet who, like the author of Isa. xxiv.–xxvii., played so important a part in the history of thought on the subject of salvation, sink into oblivion.

The Judgment upon the Earth, Chap. XXIV.

Like xix. 1, the first verse of chap. xxiv. places us at once in the very midst of the catastrophe, and the contents of the subsequent description of the judgment are gathered together in a few comprehensive sentences (as in xv. 1, xvii. 1, xxiii. 1, cf. xxxiii. 1). Vers. 1–3: "*Behold, Jehovah poureth out the earth and layeth it waste, and marreth its form and scattereth its inhabitants. And it fareth as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the creditor, so with the debtor. Emptying the earth is emptied out, and plundering is plundered, for Jehovah hath spoken this word.*" As it does everywhere in Isaiah (iii. 1, xvii. 1, xix. 1, xxx. 27, and frequently), הִנֵּה points to something future. It is also only in Isaiah that we find prophecies beginning like this with nothing but הנה; for though the most nearly parallel beginnings, Jer. xlvii. 2, xlix. 35, cf. li. 1, Ezek. xxix. 3, do commence with הנה, an introductory formula precedes. The emphatic כִּי ה' דִּבֶּר, which everywhere in Isaiah forms the conclusion of a statement about the future, occurs by no means exclusively (Obad. 18; Joel iv. 8; Micah iv. 4; 1 Kings xiv. 11), though, no doubt, principally in the Book of Isaiah (i. 20, xxi. 17, xxii. 25, xxv. 8, xl. 5, lviii. 14; cf. in addition, specially xix. 4 and xvi. 13, xxxvii. 22). The detailed enumeration of ver. 2 has Isaianic parallels in ii. 12–16, iii. 2 sq., 18–23, cf. ix. 13 (cf. also xix. 2–4, where there is a judgment unfolded which concludes similarly). The prophet begins at this early stage to play with sounds. There is a similarity in the ring of בָּקַק (root בק, reproducing the sound of a liquid gradually emptying itself out) and בָּלַק (cf. Arab. *ballûḳa*, an empty land, desert), as in Nah. ii. 11,

cf. 3; Jer. li. 2. The Niphal imperfects are intentionally written תִּבּוֹק and תִּבּוֹז (instead of תִּבַּק, תִּבַּז), as if from hollow roots, in order that they may rhyme with the absolute infinitives (cf. xxii. 13). Instead, too, of the regular כְּנִבְרָתָה, we have כִּנְבִרתה with more closely attracted כְּ for the sake of getting the same opening sound as in the case of the other ten words. מַלְוֶה is a lender, and לֹוֶה one who deals in loans (borrower). In the clause in which the comparison is drawn, נֹשֶׁא (so here according to the Massora, whereas in 1 Sam. xxii. 2, נֹשֵׂא) is written instead of נֹשֶׂה. Similarly נָשֵׂא elsewhere also occurs alongside of נָשָׂה, and indeed from comparison of נָשָׁא, to prorogue, to delay, to credit, is the original form. נֹשֶׂה is the creditor, and אֲשֶׁר נֹשֶׂא בּוֹ is not the person who has borrowed from him, but, as נָשָׂה everywhere means to credit (*Hiph.* give credit), the one whom he lends to (with ב of *obj.* like נָגַשׁ בְּ, ix. 3), not the person through whom he is נֹשֵׂא (Hitzig on Jer. xv. 10). Hence—likeness of creditor, likeness of debtor—*i.e.* it fares with the one exactly as with the other. The judgment is one that embraces all without distinction of rank and condition. It is universal, too, not merely within the borders of the entire land of Israel, but as regards the inhabitants of the earth, for הָאָרֶץ means the earth here, and implies even the New Testament ethical idea of *κόσμος* as in xi. 4.

That it is so, vers. 4–9 show, where the condition of the curse-smitten earth is more particularly described, and its cause stated: "*Stricken down, lying withered is the earth; languishing and withered is the world; they have languished away, the foremost of the people of the earth. And the earth is become regardlessly wicked under its inhabitants, for they transgressed revelations, violated the statute, broke the everlasting covenant. Therefore Curse hath devoured the earth, and they who dwell in it make expiation; therefore are burnt up the inhabitants of the earth, and there remain few mortals. The juice of the grape mourns, withered is the vine, all the merry-hearted groan. Hushed is the joyous playing of timbrel, ceased has the uproar of the exultant, hushed is the joyous playing of the lute. They do not drink wine with song, bitter tastes strong drink to them who drink it.*" תֵּבֵל (always without the

article, after the fashion of proper nouns) and הָאָרֶץ, which are in general in this cycle of prophecy interchangeable, are used here (ver. 4), as in xxvi. 9, as parallel expressions. In poetry תֵּבֵל signifies the earth, and that without limitation (also xiii. 11, xviii. 3), so that הָאָרֶץ also is used here in the most comprehensive sense (not as in the passage xxxiii. 9, which contains the same play on sounds). The earth, including מְרוֹם, the high ones (*abstr. pro concr.* like כָּבוֹד, v. 13, xxii. 24) of the earth's people (עַם, as in xlii. 5, xl. 7, of humanity), is plunged into mourning, and is become like a withered heat-wasted plant. אֻמְלְלָה (from אָמַל, אָמְלָל, to be or become long, to hang down far, loosely, withered) stands in semi-pause, thus bringing into prominence the following subject. It is the penalty of the sin of the earth's inhabitants which the earth has to share, for the iniquity of those who live on it has been imparted to it. חָנֵף (חָנַף) means to be degenerate, set on evil (ix. 16), regardlessly wicked, used thus intransitively of a land to have the guilt of iniquity, especially blood-guiltiness, attaching to it (Ps. cvi. 38; Num. xxxv. 33; cf. *transit.* Jer. iii. 9). The regardlessly wicked conduct of men, by which the earth has been made חֳנֻפָּה, is expressed in three short hurried indignantly excited sentences (cf. xv. 6, xvi. 4, xxix. 20, xxxiii. 8; also xxiv. 5, i. 4, vi. 8, and not in Isaiah; Joel i. 10; and, perhaps, Josh. vii. 11). In view of the universal reference in הָאָרֶץ, we cannot understand by law merely the positive law of Israel. There is, however, also a positive law older than Israel. It was with the human race in the person of Noah, and so before it had split into peoples, that God made an everlasting covenant consisting of promises and obligations. But the inhabitants of the earth have transgressed (עָבְרוּ) this revealed rule of life; they have forsaken (left behind them, חָלְפוּ; cf. *aḥlafa*, to become faithless, *ḫulf*, the non-fulfilling what was promised) this law; they have broken this covenant (הֵפֵרוּ, root פר, separate, *dirimere*). Israel is included among the transgressors, and by this the choice of expression is determined. With עַל־כֵּן the prophecy, exactly as in v. 25, cf. 24, makes the transition from the sin to the punishment. אָלָה is the curse of God with which the transgressors of His law are threatened (Dan.

ix. 11; cf. the borrowed passage Jer. xxiii. 10, from which, in some codices and editions, אָבְלָה in place of אָכְלָה has passed into our passage). The curse of God devours, for it is fire, and a fire devouring from within outwards (see i. 31, v. 24, ix. 18, x. 16 sq., xxix. 6, xxx. 27 sqq., xxxiii. 11–14). חָרוּ (*Milel*) from חָרַר, they are burned out, *exusti*. With regard to וַיֶּאְשְׁמוּ, it is hardly necessary to remark that it is not to be referred to אָשַׁם = אָשֵׁם, שָׁמַם, but of the two meanings *culpam contrahere* and *culpam sustinere* has the latter. We should note in the vanishing away of men till there is only a small remnant an Isaianic feature; נִשְׁאָר (שָׁאָר) is the formal word for this remnant. מְזֻעָר (used of number here and in xvi. 14, of time, x. 25, xxix. 17) is exclusively Isaianic, and אֱנוֹשׁ is used as in xxxiii. 8; cf. xiii. 12. Ver. 7 reminds us of Joel chap. i. (cf. on the short sentences xxix. 20, xvi. 8–10) vers. 8 and 9, of v. 12, 14, and other Isaianic passages. עֲלִיז is found only in Isaiah (Zeph. ii. 15 derives it from Isa. xxii. 2, xxxii. 13; Zeph. iii. 11, like Isa. xiii. 3), and for בְּשִׁיר (with joyous song), cf. xxx. 32 (with beating of timbrels and playing of lutes) together with xxviii. 7. The description is elegiac, and dwells so long on wine (cf. chap. xvi.), because as a vegetable product and as a drink it is of all the gifts of God in nature the one that most gladdens the human heart (Ps. civ. 15; Judg. ix. 13). All the means of enjoyment are destroyed, and even though much of what gladdens still exists, it is bitter to men's taste.

The world and its pleasure are judged, judged also the city of the world, where the world's power and pleasure were concentrated. Vers. 10–13: "*Broken to pieces is the city of Tōhu, shut up every house, not to be set foot in. A cry of lamentation because of the wine is in the fields, all gladness has set, the joy of the earth is banished. Of the city there is left desolation, and the gate was battered into ruins. For so will it be within the earth, in the midst of the peoples, as at the beating of the olive, as at the gleaning, when the vintage is over.*" In view of the fact that קִרְיַת is joined on to תֹּהוּ (a kind of proper name), it is not possible to take קִרְיַת תֹּהוּ collectively (like Rosenmüller, Drechsler), and the context, in which, as we saw, הָאָרֶץ has the sense of *κόσμος*, prevents our understanding it (like Schegg, Stier, and others) of Jerusalem (according to

xxxii. 13 sq.). It is the city that is the centre of the world and its alienation from God, whose end will be תֹּהוּ as its essence was תֹּהוּ; destruction of the harmony of the divine order was its essence, destruction of its existence and precipitation back into the chaos of the primeval beginning will be its end. Rome is similarly called *turbida Roma* in Persius, i. 5. Here, too, everything is Isaianic: תֹּהוּ is used as in xxix. 21; and with regard to מְבוֹא (*ita ut ingredi nequeas, scil.* on account of the ruins that block up the entrance), cf. xxiii. 1, vii. 8, xvii. 1; also v. 9, vi. 11, xxxii. 13. Crying on account of the wine in the fields outside, ver. 11 (cf. Job v. 10), is lamentation over the destruction of the vineyards. Wine, which is one of the favourite Isaianic symbols, stands here, too, for all the natural sources of joy conjointly. The expression עָרְבָה כָּל־שִׂמְחָה presupposes an affinity between joy and light, for עָרַב, غَرِبَ, means to go away, and, especially, to set of the sun (Assyr. *erêb šamši*, sunset). Of the city (הָעִיר, partitive, as in case of בּוֹ, x. 22) nothing more is left (נִשְׁאַר) than שַׁמָּה, which it has become (cf. v. 9, xxxii. 14). The strong gates, which once swarmed with men, are battered (נֻכְּתָה, as in Micah i. 7, for נוּכְּתָה, Gesen. § 67, Rem. 8) into ruins (שְׁאִיָּה, *ἅπ. λεγ.*, noun predicative of consequence, as in xxxvii. 26, into desolated heaps; cf. vi. 11 and elsewhere). Then there is left in the wide circuit of the earth (vi. 12, vii. 22; but הָאָרֶץ, the earth, as in x. 23, xix. 24), and in the midst of what has hitherto been a crowd of peoples (cf. Micah v. 6 sq.), only a small remnant of men. The metaphors of this passage, which is a miniature of xvii. 4–6, express the fundamental thought which runs through the Book of Isaiah from beginning to end. The state of matters produced by the catastrophe is like the olive-beating, which recovers the fruit left hanging when the trees were stripped, and like the grape-gleaning after the grape harvest has been fully gathered in (כָּלָה, here as in x. 25, xvi. 4, xxi. 16, and frequently = to be past, whereas it means to be hopelessly gone, xxxii. 10, like xv. 6); there will be as few men left in the great wide world as olives and grapes after the principal harvest in each case. Those who are saved belong especially, but not exclusively (Joel iii. 5), to Israel. The place where they assemble is the land of promise.

There a community now exists which, purified by the judgment, now rouses itself to discharge its calling as the apostle of the world. Vers. 14, 15: "*Those will lift up their voice, shout exultingly; because of Jehovah's majesty they shout from the sea: 'Therefore in the lands of the sun praise ye Jehovah, in the isles of the sea the name of Jehovah the God of Israel.'*" The reason and matter of rejoicing is גְּאוֹן יְ, *i.e.* that Jehovah has shown Himself so majestic in judgment and mercy (xii. 5 sq.), and is now so manifest in His exaltedness (ii. 11, 17). Therefore the sound of rejoicing comes from the Mediterranean (מִיָּם), by which the land where Jehovah's community dwelt is washed. The community when turned in that direction had before it the islands and coastlands (אִיֵּי הַיָּם, as only once more, xi. 11; cf. Ezek. xxvi. 18) of the European west, and behind it the lands of the Asiatic east, called אֹרִים, the lands of the light, *i.e.* of the sunrise. This is the meaning that we, along with F. Schelling, Drechsler, Grünbaum (*Ztschft. deut. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xxi. 597), put on the word אֹרִים (a ἅπ. λεγ., like מְאוּרָה, xi. 8).[1] The reading באיים (Lowth, J. D. Michaelis, Hitzig, Cheyne, Driver, on authority of LXX.) destroys the antithesis of east and west, which we are led to look for. The summons goes forth in both directions, and calls, because of the manifestation of the glory of Jehovah, Israel's God (xviii. 7) to the praise of His name. His שֵׁם (cf. xxx. 27) is just His essence or nature as made known and rendered capable of being named in His acts of judgment and mercy.

The summons, too, does not go forth in vain. Ver. 16*a*: "*From the border of the earth we hear songs, 'Praise to the righteous one!'*" It is not unnatural to think that in לַצַּדִּיק Jehovah is meant; but, as Hitzig rightly remarks, הַצַּדִּיק is never used thus absolutely of Jehovah (cf. Ps. cxii. 4, where,

[1] Döderlein compares the Arabic أُورٌ, *septentrio*, but this is the Greek ἔρεβος. It is more natural to think of regions in the west, for أَوَارٌ means the time between mid-day and sunset, like the Talmudic אוֹר (אוֹרְתָּא), the evening, in Pehlvi אוֹרוּרָאן, *urwerân*, western; cf. אוּרְיָא, western region, *Bathra* 25*a*, *Kiddushin* 12*b*, which, however, according to Fried. Delitzsch, *Assyr. Studien*, p. 141, might be a contraction of the Assyrian *aḫarru*.

however, it is connected with other attributes, and Ex. ix. 27 where it occurs in an antithesis), and, in addition to this, צְבִי is what Jehovah bestows (iv. 2, xxviii. 5), while what is given to him is not צְבִי but כָּבוֹד. We must therefore explain the passage in accordance with iii. 10; cf. Hab. ii. 4. It is the community of the righteous whose faith has outlasted the fire of the judgment of wrath that is intended. Its summons to praise Jehovah is answered from the border of the earth with songs, in which it is thanked and congratulated. The earth is thought of under the figure of a garment spread out; כָּנָף is the edge or end of it—the most distant eastern and western extremities (cf. xi. 12). The grateful songs, whose echo sounds in the ears of the community of the future, rise from that quarter.

The prophet feels himself *ἐν πνεύματι* to be a member of this community. Still all at once he becomes conscious of sufferings that must first of all be got over, and which he cannot see without himself experiencing also. Vers. 16*b*–20: "*Then I said, Ruin to me! Ruin to me! Woe to me! Robbers rob, and, like robbers robbing, they rob. Terror and pit and snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth! And it comes to pass, whoso fleeth from the tidings of the terror falls into the pit, and whoso escapeth out of the pit is taken in the snare; for the trap-doors of the height above are opened, and the earth's foundations quake. Breaking breaks up the earth; bursting bursts up earth; tottering totters earth to its fall: reeling reels earth like a drunken man, and swings like a hammock; and the weight of its crimes presses heavily on it, and it falls and rises not again.*" וָאֹמַר (cf. vi. 5) is connected with an apocalypse in the same way as, *e.g.*, in Rev. vii. 14. He said it at that time when in a state of ecstasy; now when he is writing down what he saw, this saying is a thing of the past. Behind the final salvation there is a final judgment of wrath, and looking back to that he broke out into the cry of pain; רָזִי־לִי, consuming, wasting away (see x. 16, xvii. 4) to me, *i.e.* I must pass away. The word רָזִי is formed like טָרִי, קָלִי, שָׁנִי, עָנִי, and is really a neuter adjective, meaning *emaciatum* = *macies:* it is from רָזָה, to make disappear, wipe away, Arab. رَزِيَ, رَزِئَ, more general in signification = to damage, whence *razîya*, plur. *razâyâ*, Palmyr. רזאן,

calamities (*Ztschft. deut. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xviii. 81); cf., however, also رَنِيَ, to be enfeebled, exhausted. He sees a dreadful fierce people at work among men and treasures thinning them out (cf. for the play upon sound in בגד, *tecte agere, i.e.* from behind, treacherously, trickily, xxi. 2, xxxiii. 1). The exclamation, "terror and pit," etc. (applied by Jer. xlviii. 43 sq. to the fate coming on Moab from the Chaldeans), is not an invocation, but only the deeply-felt statement of the inevitable. The words pit and snare compare men to game and the enemies to hunters (cf. Jer. xvi. 16; Lam. iv. 19). פַּחַת is derived from a strong verb, פָּחַת (cf. the popular Arabian proverb, "whoever digs a pit for others, نَاحِتُ بِئْرٍ, falls into it himself"); יִלָּכֵד, as in viii. 15, xxviii. 13. The עָלֶיךָ in עָלֶיךָ is used exactly as in Judg. xvi. 9; cf. Isa. xvi. 9. Whoever, on hearing the terrible news, flees before it (מִן, as in xxxiii. 3), by no means escapes the destruction, but falls into its clutches, if not in the one way, then in the other (the very same thought which is expressed twice by Amos in v. 19, and again at greater length and in more terribly sublime words in ix. 1–4). The instruments of punishment referred to in בְּוֹנְדִים are kept in the background. What stands in the foreground and dominates the whole is the thought that the judgment is a direct act of God Himself. For this reason it is described as if it were another flood (for the אֲרֻבּוֹת, sluices, *καταῤῥάκται*, of the *rakîa'* point back to Gen. vii. 11, viii. 2; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 23), and represented as an earthquake. מוֹסְדֵי אֶרֶץ are the foundations on which the visible body of the earth rests. The three reflexive forms in ver. 19 together with their gerundives, the latter of which help the mind to take in, by keeping steadily before it, each stage of the catastrophe, fix in a word-picture the way in which the earth in its quaking first breaks, then bursts and falls. רֹעָה seems to be a slip of the pen for רֹעַ, unless, as in Hab. iii. 9, it is a *nomen actionis* instead of the *inf. abs.*; the accentuation, however (different from Prov. xxv. 19, where *Dechî* does not indicate the place of the tone), treats the *ah* as a toneless addition, and the form therefore (like קֹב, Num. xxiii. 25) as *inf. absol.* The reflexive form הִתְרֹעֵעַ is here, of course, not *Hithpal.* from רוּעַ, *vociferari*, but *Hithpo.* from רָעַע (רָצַץ),

frangere. The earth first of all gets fractured, then yawning chasms open, once more it sways to and fro, and falls. It is no longer possible for it to keep upright, its enormities bear it heavily down (כָּבֵד for כָּבַד, the weight being represented as active), so that now for the last time it reels like a drunk man (xxviii. 7, xxix. 9), or like a hammock (i. 8), then falls never to rise again. The articles with כ express the genus. נוּד, whence הִתְנוֹדֵד, is connected with נוּט (Ps. xcix. 1), just as טלט, to turn oneself hither and thither in walking, *se balancer*, with מוּט, whence חִתְמוֹטֵט.

If the old earth perishes in such a manner from its place in the universe, God will at the same time (the prophet does not break up in thought and chronologically arrange what belongs to the end of all things) punish the princes of heaven as well as the princes of earth. The secrets of two worlds here unveil themselves to the gaze of the Old Testament seer. Vers. 21–23: "*And it comes to pass in that day, Jehovah will visit the host of the height in the height, and the kings of the earth on the earth. And they are immured as one immures prisoners in the pit, and shut up in the prison, and after the expiry of many days they are visited. And covered with shame is the moon and confounded the sun, for as king reigns Jehovah of hosts on Mount Zion, and before His elders is glory.*" In view of the antithesis of מָרוֹם and אֲדָמָה (cf. xxiii. 17*b*), which is made as sharp and prominent as possible, we cannot (with the Targum, Luther, Calvin, Hävernick) understand by the host of the height earthly powers. The name itself is also opposed to this view; for צְבָא מָרוֹם, as is shown by ver. 18 (where מְשֻׁכָּמִים = מְפֻרָסִים, cf. xxxiii. 5, xxxvii. 23, xl. 26), is equivalent to צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם, and everywhere this is either the starry host (xl. 26) or the angelic host (1 Kings xxii. 19; Ps. cxlviii. 2), occasionally both in one without distinction (Neh. ix. 6). As sun and moon are mentioned in ver. 23, we might be inclined to think (with Baudissin, G. A. Smith, and others) that here the host of the height is the starry host: "The shining kingly forms of the sky, the stars out of which idols have been made fall from their altars, and the kings of the earth from their thrones" (Umbreit). The antithetical member מַלְכֵי, however, compels us to suppose that צְבָא הַמָּרוֹם also designates personal powers, and the par-

ticularizing account of the penal visitation (פָּקַד עַל, as in xxvii. 1, 3, cf. xxvi. 21, and the verbal and material parallel, Jer. xlvi. 25), "they are immured," etc., which in some way or another must be applicable also to the host of heaven, postulates personality. It might be objected that it is the kings who are immured, and that in the putting to shame of the sun and moon in ver. 23, the penal visitation of the host of heaven is expressed. The fact, however, that sun and moon are thrown into the shade by the revelation of the glory of Jehovah, we cannot for a moment admit to be punishment. But if צְבָא מָרוֹם is the angelic host, the penal visitation referred to must be one that, happening within the spirit-world, stands in causal connection with the history of humanity, specially with the history of the peoples. Consequently צְבָא מָרוֹם will have to be understood as meaning the angels of the peoples and kingdoms (Abn Ezra, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Knobel), and the presupposition of this prophecy is what is stated in Deut. xxxii. 8*a*, LXX. (cf. Syriac, xvii. 14), and represented in the visions of the Book of Daniel, viz. that there is a world of spirits which God employs to carry on His government of the world, and which influences not only the life of the individual, but also the history of the peoples. God's judgment here goes forth, as against the kings of earth so against the celestial guardian powers of the peoples, though it need not from this be supposed that these guardian powers were from the first rebel angels. They come under God's penal visitation, because they have misled the peoples whom it was their duty to lead.[1] Ver. 22*a* states the preliminary punishment of the angelic as well as of the human princes. אֲסֻפָּה takes the place of an *inf. intens.* like טַלְטֵלָה, xxii. 17. עֲרִיָּה, Hab. iii. 9, cf. רֵעָה, ver. 19, and the construction אֲסֻפָּה אָסַף, following the verbal expression אָסַף אָסִיר, to immure a captive, means "immuring after the manner of immuring captives;" for אָסַף, to gather, in x. 14, xxxiii. 4, has here the signification to immure (thrust into), as in Gen. xlii. 17. Both verbs are used with עַל, because the captives are thrust down into pit and ward from above (עַל contains

[1] Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. p. 814 sq., shows how familiar later Judaism was with this idea.

the two ideas *upon* or *over* anything and *into* it, *e.g.* 1 Sam. xxxi. 4; 2 Kings iv. 4; Job vi. 16; see Hitzig on Nah. iii. 12). How we are to understand this is shown by 2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6, with the parallels in the Book of Henoch (xviii. 14–16, cf. x. 12 sq.) and the Jubilees (chap. v.). The prophet is thinking of the abyss of Hades, where they are reserved, bound with chains of darkness *εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας*. In accordance with this parallel, we must apparently understand by יִפָּקְדוּ, on the analogy of xxix. 6, Ezek. xxxviii. 8, cf. פָּקַד, *seq. acc.*, xxvi. 21 (also xxvi. 14), Ps. lix. 6: visitation in wrath, and so execution of the final punishment. Hitzig, Ewald, Knobel, Luzzatto, on the other hand, understand by it a visitation in mercy; Gesenius, Umbreit, and others (without support in idiom or custom), a citation. A comparison of xxiii. 17 in relation to xxiii. 15 (following which the Targum and Saadia paraphrase, they will come again into remembrance) is in favour of visitation in mercy; they are visited in getting free again (cf. Rev. xx. 3). They then begin again their former life, but only immediately (as ver. 23 says) to lose for ever their temporarily re-acquired dominion. Then the Lord reigns with His own in the new Jerusalem in such glory that the silvery moon (לְבָנָה) shamefacedly veils itself, and the glowing sun (חַמָּה) is confounded with shame (see on i. 29), because in the presence of such glory the two great lights of heaven will be, according to a Jewish expression, כִּשְׁרָגָא בְּטִיהֲרָא, like a lamp in the noontide sunshine. Noteworthy among the many parallels to ver. 23 found in Isaiah (חַמָּה and לְבָנָה, xxx. 26; חָפֵר and בּוּשׁ, i. 29; מָלֵא, xxxiii. 22; on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, x. 12) are those to the concluding noun-sentence וְנֶגֶד זְקֵנָיו כָּבוֹד, especially xi. 10 (also iv. 5), and for the definition of the idea in זְקֵנִים, i. 26, cf. iii. 14. "His elders," as also the twenty-four *πρεσβύτεροι* of the Apocalypse, are not angels, but men. Angels never become זְקֵנִים (see *Iris*, p. 174). They are elders after God's own heart, such as in contrast with its present bad זְקֵנִים (iii. 14) are promised to the Israel of the Jerusalem of the future (i. 26). These, being admitted to God's immediate presence and reigning with Him, are confronted with nothing but glory, and it they reflect.

The Fourfold Hymnic Echo, Chaps. XXV., XXVI.

A.—*The first echo: salvation of the peoples after the fall of the city of the world,* chap. xxv. 1–8.

But what at this time is accomplished finds not only its reflection but also its echo. At xxv. 1 sqq. the hymnic echoes begin. The prophet, transported to the end of time, celebrates what he saw in psalms and songs. These do not reproduce merely the contents of the prophecy, but by penetrating to its depths and drawing out of it, they partly develop, partly provide the means for developing it further. The first echo is xxv. 1–8, or more exactly xxv. 1–5. The prophet, whom from chap. xii. we already know to be a psalmist, acts as leader of the community of the future, and praises Jehovah for having destroyed the mighty city of the world, and for having proved Himself the shield and defence of the hitherto oppressed community against the tyranny of the city of the world. Vers. 1–5: "*Jehovah, my God art Thou! I will exalt Thee, praise Thy name, that Thou hast done wonders, counsels from afar, truthfulness, truth. For Thou hast turned what was a city into a heap of stones, the steep castle into ruins, the erection of barbarians into a city of the past, for ever not to be rebuilt. Therefore will a fierce people honour Thee, cities of violent nations fear Thee. For Thou didst prove Thyself to be a stronghold to the humble, a stronghold to the poor in his distress, a shelter from the rain-storm, a shade from the sun's burning; for the blast of violent ones became like a rain-storm against a wall. Like the sun's burning in a thirsty land Thou didst subdue the uproar of the barbarians; like the sun's burning before the shadow of clouds had the violent men's song of victory to subside.*" The introduction, in structure reminding us somewhat of the "Aufgesang" of the Minnesingers, is to be understood in accordance with Ps. cxviii. 28: Jehovah (*vocat.*), my God art Thou. This confession of faith now sounds forth in tones of increased strength and fervour. Among the many plays on sound in the cycle of prophecy the rhyme *aromimcha* (see as to *i* on i. 15, lii. 12), *ōdeh šimcha* is noteworthy. עָשִׂיתָ פֶּלֶא (like Ps. lxxvii. 15, lxxviii. 12) is taken from Ex. xv. 11 (as xii. 2 from Ex. xv. 2). The

wonders now accomplished are עֲצוֹת מֵרָחוֹק, resolutions taken far back, *i.e.* long before, God's thoughts from eternity,—the same ideal view as in xxii. 11, xxxvii. 26 (a perfect parallel in every respect to our passage), and all through the second part. Nägelsbach translates, "counsels with a distant object," but even לְמֶרְחוֹק of xxxvii. 26 points to the past in such a connection. It is the manifold עֵצָה of the Holy One of Israel (v. 19, xiv. 24–27, xix. 12, 17, xxiii. 8, xxviii. 29) which displays its wonders in the events that happen in time. The phrase עָשָׂה חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת requires us to connect *emûma ómen* with עֲשִׂיתָ as accusative of the second and third object. Derivatives from the same original stand side by side in order to emphasize the idea as much as possible, as in iii. 1, xvi. 6. אֱמוּנָה means faith and faithfulness (from the root idea of firmness) as qualities and conditions; אֹמֶן (only here) is faithfulness proved and maintained in deeds. Jehovah has shown constancy, has been constant, *i.e.* once having allowed His word to take effect, He has stood to it. The city of the world is overthrown. Jehovah has, as the first sentence, ending with *zakef*, says, transposed out of the nature of a city into the condition of a heap of stones. The parallel member might lead us to look for הָעִיר, but the sentence as it stands brings only the change effected into prominence. לְ is used as in, *e.g.*, xxiii. 13; cf. xxxvii. 26; and מִן as in vii. 8, xvii. 1, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 10. מַפֵּלָה (here and xxiii. 13) or מַפָּלָה (xvii. 1) is a word, instances of which are found only in the Book of Isaiah. עִיר, קִרְיָה, and אַרְמוֹן are likewise words commonly used by Isaiah in parallelisms (i. 26, xxii. 2, xxxii. 13 sq.); and זָרִים, as in i. 7, xxix. 5, is the most general designation of the enemies of the people of God. The fall of the world-empire is followed by the conversion of the heathen; for the songs, xxiv. 16, come from the lips of the farthest peoples. Ver. 3 runs parallel with Rev. xv. 3 sq. Peoples, down to this time uncivilised and slaves of their passions (עַז), submit to Jehovah with proper reverence; those hitherto despotically oppressive (עָרִיצִים, as in xiii. 11 of the form שַׁלִּישִׁים, פָּרִיצִים), with humble fear. The reason for this conversion of the heathen is, as stated in the Apocalypse, *ὅτι τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐφανερώθησαν.* דַּל and אֶבְיוֹן (cf. xiv. 30, xxix. 19) are names of the *ecclesia pressa*, as we know from their use in the Psalms. Jehovah has proved Himself to

her in her distress (בַּצַּר לוֹ, as in xxvi. 16, lxiii. 9, cf. xxxiii. 2) a stronghold (מָעוֹז from עָזַז) or refuge (from עוּז, عاذ, see on xxx. 3), in short, a place of safety, a protection against the storm, and shade from the heat (cf. as to the figures, iv. 6, xxxii. 2, xvi. 3; Sir. xxxi. 16, Greek text), so that the blast of the tyrants (cf. רוּחַ, xxx. 28, xxxiii. 11; Ps. lxxvi. 13) became like a wall-storm, *i.e.* like a storm which comes in contact with a wall (cf. ix. 3, shoulder-stick, *i.e.* one which comes in contact with the shoulder), dashes against it and is broken, without being able to wash it away (xxviii. 17; Ps. lxii. 4), for it is the wall of a strong castle, and this strong castle is Jehovah Himself. As Jehovah is able to subdue all of a sudden the sun's intense heat in dryness (צִיּוֹן, *abstr. pro concr.*, as in xxxii. 2 = אֶרֶץ צִיָּה, xli. 18), and it is allayed as soon as He raises a shady cover (Jer. iv. 29), *i.e.* of clouds (Ex. xix. 9; Ps. xviii. 12), so does He of a sudden subdue the raging (שְׁאוֹן, as in xvii. 12) of the hordes that assail His people, and the tyrants' song of triumph (זְמִיר, elsewhere only Cant. ii. 12), which spread over the world like scorching heat, is made to subside. עָנָה has its neuter root meaning, "to bow or bend" (Arab. عنا, *impf. o.*), as in xxxi. 4.

So the first hymnic echo dies out, and the eschatological prophecy, returning to xxiv. 23, but with a power of insight increased by prayer, proceeds. Ver. 6: "*And Jehovah of hosts prepares for all peoples on this mountain a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things rich in marrow, of wines on the lees well strained.*" "This mountain" is Zion, the place of God's presence, the place of His community's worship. The feast thought of therefore is a spiritual one, an antitype of the meals in connection with the Shelamîm sacrifices (cf. Ps. xxii. 26 sqq.), which it far surpasses. שְׁמָרִים, elsewhere lees (from שָׁמַר, to lay past or up, to let ferment), are here *vina faccata*, as Cato, *de re rust.* c. 154, calls wines which have lain on the lees for a long time for the sake of gaining in strength, colour, and durability. Of course שְׁמָרִים really means the *facces* themselves; and bad wines might bear this name, as *facx Laletana* in Martial, i. 27. But the adjective does away with the idea of dregginess. For שְׁמָרִים מְזֻקָּקִים are wines which, left on their lees after the first fermentation, have

thoroughly fermented and long settled, and which are filtered before drinking (Greek, *οἶνος σακκίας, i.e. διϊλισμένος* or *διηθικός*, from *διηθεῖν, percolare*), hence strong clear wines. שְׁמָנִים is equivalent to חֲלָבִים from חֵלֶב, שֶׁמֶן being also applied to animal fat (x. 27, xvii. 4, x. 16). שְׁמָנִים מְמֻחִים does not mean pieces of fat meat deprived of the marrow, for the *Piel* (Arab. مخّ) is used privatively, but never the *Pual*, and seldom the *Kal* (see Mühlau on Prov. xxxi. 3); then "to deprive of marrow" can only be applied to bones, not to fat meat itself; thirdly, we expect in this place rather to find mention of abundance of marrow. So the meaning of the adjective is "made marrowy," "provided with marrow," *medullata*. The thing thus symbolized is the full enjoyment of blessedness in the perfected kingdom of God. The heathen are not only humbled in such a way that they submit to the Lord, they also have share in the blessedness of His community, and are satisfied with the abundance of His house, and given to drink of delight as of a stream (Ps. xxxvi. 9). This verse (6) sounds like the joyful music of the heavenly feast. The choice of the more flexible form מְמֻחִים (from the original מְמֻחֵי = מְמֻחֶה) instead of מְמֻחִים is intentional. We hear, as it were, the playing of rapidly-bowed stringed instruments.

The feast is on earth, for the Old Testament knows nothing of a heaven where blessed men are gathered. Still the promise takes a higher flight than anywhere else. Vers. 7, 8: "*And He swallows off on this mountain the veil that veils over all peoples, and the cover that is covered over all nations. He swallows off death for ever, and the All-Lord, Jehovah, wipes the tear from every face, and the shame of His people He takes away from the whole earth; for Jehovah hath spoken it.*" On the back of what Jehovah bestows comes what He removes. "This mountain" is specified as the place where this also is accomplished. He who decreed death and now also abolishes it is Jehovah Elohim. Veil and cover (מַסֵּכָה from נָסַךְ = מָסַךְ, xxii. 8, from נסך, whence *nâsik*, protector, prince; *mussikku*, protection = sovereignty, supremacy. *Ztschft. deut. morgenl. Gesellschaft*, xxviii. 128) are symbols, not of grief and affliction, but of spiritual blindness, like the *κάλυμμα* on the heart of Israel in 2 Cor. iii. 15. פְּנֵי הַלּוֹט (cf. Job xli. 5) is the outer or upper

side of the veil. Nägelsbach asks, "Was He then likely to take hold of it from behind?" Undoubtedly it is possible to tear off a veil in this way, but Jehovah grasps it by the פנים, removing it, not with violence, but with care. The second הַלּוֹט is not a passive form (Kimchi), but for the sake of the homophony, takes the place of הַלָּט (see iv. 6, vii. 11, viii. 6, xxii. 13); cf. the obscure Niphal forms, xxiv. 3 (Gesen. § 72, Rem. 1). With regard to the names for the veil,—in לוֹט the idea of all-sidedness predominates; in מַסֵּכָה that of density. The removing of the veil, as well as of death, is called בִּלַּע, a word which is used of God also in xix. 3; Ps. xxi. 10, lv. 10. He has abolished death (בִּלַּע, *absorbere*, see on iii. 12), so that no trace of its former sway is to be seen. Paul renders freely: *κατεπόθη* (בִּלַּע [1]) *ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος*, 1 Cor. xv. 54 (following the Aramaic נְצַח, which, like זְכָא, cf. Ps. li. 6, LXX., developes the meaning of "conquering," from the root-idea of being prominent, bright, outshining). The Syriac version, uniting the ideas of the Targum (לְעָלְמִין) and of Paul, translates *absorpta est mors per victoriam in sempiternum*. The annihilation of death, however, is in itself not yet the perfection of blessedness. There are sufferings which wring out a sigh for death as bringing deliverance. From all these sufferings, too, which are to be traced finally to sin, Jehovah grants release. דִּמְעָה, here as in Eccles. iv. 1, is a collective idea; cf. Rev. xxi. 4, *πᾶν δάκρυον*. Wherever there is a tear on any face whatever, Jehovah wipes it away; and since Jehovah does so, it is thoroughly done. He removes the cause along with its manifestation, the sin along with the tear. Naturally this applies to the *ecclesia triumphans*. The world is, of course, judged, and what it is possible to save is saved. There is therefore, too, no such thing now as shame of the people of God. In the whole earth it has no place at all; Jehovah has cleared it out. Thus, then, the earth is a holy abode of blessed men. The new Jerusalem is indeed Jehovah's throne, but the whole earth is Jehovah's glorious kingdom. The prophet's vision of things has brought him to the same point as that reached by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 28, and John on the last page of his Apocalypse.

[1] See No. IV. of my *Reformationsgeschichtliche Curiosa* (*Evan. Luth. Kirch. Ztg.* 1884, March 28): Eine alttest. Frage Luthers (בִּלַּע or בָּלַע?) und die Antwort Bernhard Zieglers.

B.—*The second echo: the abasement of Moab,* chap. xxv. 9–12.

After the predictive vers. 6–8, which followed the first hymnic echo like a recitative introduced at that point, the song of praise begins anew, but this is soon changed into the prophetic tone. The dishonour done to the people of God, mentioned in xxv. 8, reminds us of their hostile neighbours, who, though they cannot tyrannize over it like the imperial power, yet scoff and persecute. Of these foes, the representative and emblem (cf. 2 Kings xxiv. 2) in the present passage is the boastful Moab, xvi. 6; Jer. xlviii. 29; Ezek. xxv. 8–11. It is the prediction of Moab's humiliation, in this spiritual sense, which prepares the way for the second echo by celebrating the appearance of Jehovah, who is now manifestly present as the conqueror of death, the drier of tears, the preserver of the honour of His oppressed Church. Ver. 9: "*And people say on that day, 'Behold our God, for whom we waited that He might help us; this is Jehovah, for whom we waited; let us be glad and rejoice in His salvation!'*" The undefined but self-evident subject of וְאָמַר is the Church of the latter days; הִנֵּה זֶה are connected, as in xxi. 9. The waiting is spoken of with reference to the remote past, even as far back as the exclamation of Jacob, "For Thy salvation do I wait, O Jehovah" (Gen. xlix. 18). The summons, "Let us be glad," etc., has changed into the beautiful "Praise ye" of Ps. cxviii. 24.

In the land of promise there is jubilation, but on the other side of the Jordan there is the anguish of destruction. Vers. 10–12: "*For the hand of Jehovah will sink down on this mountain, and Moab will be trodden down where it is, as a heap of straw is trodden down in the water of the dung-pit. And he spreadeth out his hands in the pool therein, as the swimmer spreadeth them out to swim; but Jehovah humbleth his* [*Moab's*] *pride, in spite of the artifices of his hands. Yea, thy steep, lofty walls He brings down, humbles, hurls to the earth, even into dust.*" Upon Zion the hand of Jehovah is brought down (נוּחַ being here used, as in vii. 2) in order to protect (Ezra viii. 22, 31), and this, too, by taking vengeance. Moab will be threshed down, stamped or trodden down (Job xxxix. 15) where it stands (תַּחְתִּיו being employed, as in

2 Sam. vii. 10, Hab. iii. 16, to signify "in his place," "in his own land," with the additional notion of banishment without any possibility of escape),—just as straw is trampled down into a dung-pit in order to become manure. הָדוֹשׁ is the construct infinitive with *û*, probably to distinguish it from the absolute infinitive הָדוֹשׁ (see Ewald, § 240*b*). Instead of בְּמוֹ (as in xliii. 2), the *Kethîb* has בְּמֵי (cf. Job ix. 30),—much more correctly, inasmuch as מַדְמֵנָה in itself does not denote the hole with dung-water, but the dung-heap, like the Arabic *dimna*. It might also be possible, however, that בְּמוֹ is meant as an allusion to the name *Moab* (מוֹאָב), as מַדְמֵנָה has probably been chosen with allusion to the Moabitish city *Madmen* (מַדְמֵן, Jer. xlviii. 2). In ver. 11, if בְּקִרְבּוֹ referred back to Moab, Jehovah would be the subject (Targum, Aben-Ezra, and Kimchi); but though the figurative representation of Jehovah as pressing down the pride of Moab, by spreading out His hands within it like a swimmer, might possibly, in another connection, produce an impression of boldness and sublimity; yet here, where Moab is described as having been forced down into the watery filth, to compare Jehovah to a swimmer would be offensive: the swimmer is Moab itself. בְּקִרְבּוֹ points back, in a neuter sense, to the place, ill-suited for swimming, into which Moab has been violently plunged. In a manure-pond one cannot swim; but, to save himself, Moab attempts it, though without success, for Jehovah presses down the pride of Moab in spite of (עִם being used as in Neh. v. 18) the אָרְבוֹת (thus written without Dagesh), "artifices," *i.e.* the clever and cunning movements of his hands. Ewald, with ארבות, compares the Arab. ارب in the sense of a "member" or "joint" (Kimchi, אצילות יָדָיו); but the comparison of ارب in the sense of "cunning, intelligence with craft and forecast" (see Lane's *Arab. Lex.*), comes nearer the Hebrew usage of אָרַב. Saadias rightly renders it by *muḥâtala*, *i.e.* tricks and devices; Hitzig by "machinations," *i.e.* twistings and turnings, which Moab makes with his arms in order to keep himself upon the water. The noun אָרְבָּה is here the *nomen actionis* from אָרַב, which originally signifies to entwine firmly and closely, then to lay wait for cunningly (cf. such

expressions as "to forge lies," "lay plans," etc.). The figurative statement in ver. 11 is exemplified literally in ver. 12. If the reading of the text were מִשְׂגַּב חֹמוֹת מְבֻצָּרֶיךָ, one would require to think of Kir-Moab (xv. 1, xvi. 7); the text as it stands, however, refers to the strong and lofty walls of the cities of Moab in general. Hitherto mention was made of but one hostile city—the imperial city of the world. This closing verse is remarkable, so that Ewald and Cheyne suppose that it originally stood in some other place; Smend, however, derives from this verse a new illustration of the whole cycle of prophecy.[1]

C.—*Third echo: Israel as restored, or raised to life again.* chaps. xxvi.–xxvii. 1.

The second hymnic echo has thus its confirmation in a prediction against Moab, on the basis of which a third hymnic echo now arises. While on the other side, in the land of Moab, the people are being trodden down and their lofty castles razed, the people in the land of Judah can boast of an impregnable city. Ver. 1: "*On that day will this song be sung in the land of Judah: Ours is a city of defence; salvation He sets for walls and bulwark.*" According to the pointing, one ought to translate "A city is a stronghold (עֹז) for us;" but it is better, in accordance with Prov. xxi. 22, to render the words "a city of powerful offence and defence belongs to us." The subject of יָשִׁית is Jehovah; the imperfect is used to signify what He is constantly doing, and always doing anew; for the main walls and the outer walls of Jerusalem (חֵל, as in Lam. ii. 8, indicating the small outermost wall which encloses the whole of the fortifications,—according to the Rabbinical interpreters, בַּר־שׁוּרָא, as the Syriac also translates the word) are not inanimate stone, but יְשׁוּעָה, an

[1] See the remarks of this author on Isa. chaps. xxiv.–xxvii., in Stade's *Zeitschrift* for 1884, pp. 161–224, where he endeavours to make out that the historical setting of this cycle of prophecy belongs to the time of the expedition of Alexander and the fall of the Persian monarchy. The portion about Moab (in xxv. 10–12) we regard as an episode, while he considers it the centre of the whole; on this view there certainly results a state of affairs (viz. the enslavement of the Jews by the Moabites) for which no historical testimony can be adduced.

ever-living and never-dying salvation (lx. 18). In the same sense, Jehovah Himself is elsewhere called the wall of Jerusalem, and a wall of fire too, Zech. ii. 9,—parallels which show that יְשׁוּעָה is meant to be taken as the accusative of the object, not (as in v. 6 ; Ps. xxi. 7, lxxxiv. 7 ; Jer. xxii. 6) as the accusative of the predicate,—the view of Luzzatto and Nägelsbach.

In ver. 1, the city is still regarded as empty ; hence the summons in ver. 2 : "*Open ye the gates, that a righteous nation may enter, one that maintains fidelity!*" The cry is a heavenly one, and those who open—if we have at all to inquire who they are—are angels. We are reminded of Ps. xxiv. 7, 9, but the scene is different ; the present passage has been individualized by the writer of Ps. cxviii. (vers. 19, 20). As in xxiv. 16, the "righteous nation" is the congregation of the righteous ones ; and גּוֹי is here used (as in ver. 15 and ix. 2) of Israel, which has now through grace become righteous, and has been confirmed in covenant-faithfulness towards God, who maintains His faithfulness (Ps. xxxi. 24. The form אֱמֻנִים is from אָמוּן).

Ver. 3 shows that the relations between Israel and Jehovah now continue the same on both sides : "*A firmly settled mind Thou keepest in peace, peace ; for on Thee rests his confidence.*" This is an apothegm taken from Ps. cxii. 7, 8, but set in a lyric context, and employed with reference to the Church of the latter days. The disposition of mind here designates him who has it, in accordance with his inmost nature. יֵצֶר is the constitution of man as inwardly taking shape in act and disposition (*i.e.* thinking and willing),—the form assumed by his whole mental life. This inner life is said to be "firmly settled" (סָמוּךְ) when it has a firm hold within itself, and this it has when it keeps a firm hold on God (x. 20). The new Israel has such a mind, and Jehovah preserves this subjective condition (נָצַר, with an object indicating the mental disposition, Prov. xxii. 12), in "peace, peace,"—an accusative of the predicate used instead of a consequential clause, and signifying "so that deep, constant, and imperturbable peace prevails within" (cf. Phil. iv. 7),—for its trust is placed on Jehovah. According to Ewald (§ 149*d*), בָּטוּחַ refers to יֵצֶר, and is thus equivalent to בָּטוּחַ הוּא

(cf. Ps. vii. 10, lv. 20), the passive participle being here used like the Lat. *confisus, fretus.* To depend on God, to be resigned to Him, brings stability and peace.

Once more a cry goes forth, as if from heaven, exhorting Israel to continue in this frame of mind. Ver. 4: "*Trust ye in Jehovah for ever; for in Jah, Jehovah, is an everlasting rock.*" עַדֵי is the construct form of עַדִי, which comes from עָדָה (like מִתֵי from מְתָה); and עַד, which is likewise formed from the same verb (like שַׁל, a fault, from שְׁלָה), properly signifies progress, far-reaching duration. The combination יְהֹוִה יָהּ is found only here and in xii. 2: it is the proper name of God the Redeemer in its most emphatic mode of expression. The so-called *Beth essentiae* stands pretty frequently before the predicate (see the remarks on Ps. xxxv. 2); here, as in Ps. lxviii. 5, lv. 19, it stands before the subject: "in Jah, Jehovah, there is an everlasting rock," *i.e.* He is essentially such a rock (cf. Deut. xxxii. 4; as Ex. xv. 2 may be compared with Isa. xii. 2), or one has such a rock in Him.

He has shown Himself to be a rock, on which everything breaks that would attack the faithful whom He encompasses. Vers. 5, 6: "*For He hath bent down those who dwell on high, the towering fortress; He tore it down, tore it down to the earth, hurled it into dust. The foot treads it to pieces,—feet of the needy one, steps of the lowly.*" After passing rapidly over the fall of Moab, there is at once celebrated the fall of the imperial city (xxv, 1, 2, xxiv. 10–12) to which Moab was but an adjunct. The imperfects are regulated by the preterite; and the anadiplosis which in other passages (like xxv. 1; cf. Ps. cxviii. 11) places words of a common derivation beside each other, here contents itself with a change in the suffix-forms. The second thought in ver. 6 is an intensification of the first: she is trodden,—trodden is she who oppressed those who have hitherto been oppressed.

The righteous ones, who, in the estimation of the world, go astray, thus reach a goal from which their way appears in quite another light. Ver. 7: "*The path on which the righteous man goes is smoothness; smooth dost Thou level the path of the just.*" יְשָׁר is the accusative of the predicate, indicating the result or consequence; פָּלַס means to make even or level, and also (as a denominative form פֶּלֶס, a balance,

by means of which an equipoise is effected) to "weigh," but not to "make horizontal:" the fundamental meaning of the word is sufficient here, so that there is no need for thinking of the balance to explain the expression. This part of the song has fallen into the style of the Solomonic proverbs (cf. Prov. iv. 26, v. 6, 21): there is a pause, as if the writer were reflecting.

In vers. 8, 9, there is then made a new beginning in lyric style: "*We have also waited for Thee* [*that Thou shouldest come*] *in the path of Thy judgments, O Jehovah; after Thy name and Thy remembrance* [*went*] *the desire of the soul. With my soul I desired Thee in the night; yea, with my spirit deeply within me I longed for Thee; for, when Thy judgments* [*strike*] *the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness.*" The Church of the last days, looking back into the past, tells how she waited longingly for the manifestation of God's righteousness which has now taken place. אַף is here employed in the same way as when we say, after something wished for has happened: "and we were right in waiting for this." "The path of Thy judgments" belongs to the "Thee," after which we must supply such a connecting expression as "that Thou shouldest come:" the poetic expression בּוֹא אֹרַח, following the analogy of הָלַךְ דֶּרֶךְ, forms the basis of the construction here. They longed for God to come as Redeemer along the path of His judgments. "Name" and "remembrance" denote the essential nature of God which becomes capable of being made the subject of speech and thought through the revelation which He makes of Himself (Ex. iii. 15). They desired that God would again come before the consciousness and memory of man in an act which would break through His concealment and silence. The prophet declares this of himself especially, for he feels himself "in spirit" to be a member of the perfected Church. נַפְשִׁי and רוּחִי are accusatives of closer specification (Ewald's *Syntax*, § 281*c*). "The night" is that of trouble and sorrow, as in xxi. 11; and with reference to this stands שְׁחַר, with an allusion to שַׁחַר ("dawn"); for the morning dawn after a night of suffering was the object for which he (נַפְשִׁי, *i.e.* with his whole personality, see *Psychology*, English translation, p. 239; and רוּחִי בְּקִרְבִּי, *i.e.* with the spirit of his mind, *πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός*,—see

Psychology, p. 180) longed. And why? Because men were brought to the knowledge, and possibly also to the self-application, of what is right, whenever God showed Himself as the Judge, punishing men for their sins (cf. Ps. ix. 17). In the clause כִּי־אִשֶּׁר מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לָאָרֶץ, the verb to be supplied is suggested (as in xxiii. 5) by the ל which indicates the object or point on which the movement terminates; the rendering of the LXX. is *διότι φῶς* (באור) *τὰ προστάγματά σου*. The perfect לָמְדוּ is the usual form in gnomic poetry, and expresses a fact of experience that has often occurred and still continues frequently to happen.

Here once more the שִׁיר has struck the tone of the מָשָׁל; and continuing in this strain it here pauses anew to reflect, as at the end of a strophe. Ver. 10: "*If favour were shown to the wicked man, he did not learn righteousness; in the most upright land, he acts perversely, and has no eye for the majesty of Jehovah.*" יֻחַן רָשָׁע is a hypothetical clause, left to be marked as such by the manner in which it is uttered, like Neh. i. 5 (Ewald's *Syntax*, § 357*b*; cf. Ges. § 159. 2), and meaning "even supposing that kindness (חֶן = *χρηστότης*, Rom. ii. 4) is shown to the wicked man:" the Hophal form יֻחַן is either written defectively for יוּחַן, or it has virtually a doubled ח; the latter is the more probable view, considering Prov. xxi. 10 (where it is written in the same way); cf. Dan. iv. 24 (where the ח of מְחַן must be regarded as virtually a doubled letter) and Job xix. 23 (יְחֻקּוּ). אֶרֶץ נְכֹחוֹת (cf. Isa. xxx. 10, lix. 14) is a land in which everything is right and is done uprightly. A villain, even supposing he were placed in such a country, will nevertheless act as a scoundrel; and for the majesty of Jehovah, which shows itself in premonitory visitations for sin, in the midst of which he is still spared, he has no perception; this thought the prophet utters in a way which reveals pain combined with his indignation.

In vers. 11–13 also the state of matters remains essentially the same: "*O Jehovah, Thy hand has been exalted, but they do not care to look: they will look, becoming ashamed, upon the zeal for a people; actually fire will devour Thine adversaries. O Jehovah, Thou wilt establish peace for us, for assuredly all our works Thou hast performed for us. O Jehovah our God, lords besides Thee had enslaved us—only through Thee will we*

praise Thy name." There are three prayer-ejaculations, each beginning with יְהוָה, which, in the case of the third, is heightened into the fuller expression "Jehovah our God." The standpoint of the first is the time before the judgment; that of the other two is in the midst of the redemption accomplished throughout the whole course of the judgment. Hence, what the prophet utters in ver. 11 will be a general truth which has now received its most splendid confirmation through the fall of the empire. The complaint of the prophet is similar to what is found in liii. 1. With this passage we are not to compare Ps. x. 5, but Ex. xiv. 8, etc. (רום does not mean to remain in the distance and unrecognised, but to prove oneself high); the hand of Jehovah has already made itself known as highly exalted (רָמָה is 3rd pers. sing.) by revealing itself in the history of the nations, protecting the Church, and, in the midst of its humiliation, preparing the way for its exaltation. But they have no eye to see this hand (בַּל marks not mere negation, but negation combined with a manifestation of feeling; its accompanying verb is followed by another, יֶחֱזוּ, but this with an objective meaning): they will be obliged to see, though they do not like to do so,—they will come to feel the hand of Jehovah in itself, especially as the Avenger of His people. The expression קִנְאַת־עָם, "zeal concerning a people," changed from this abstract form into the concrete, means the zeal of Jehovah of hosts (ix. 6, xxxvii. 32) regarding His people (עָם being used as in xlix. 8); this expression, moreover, forms the object of יֶחֱזוּ, for וַיֵּבֹשׁוּ forms a dependent clause, not an interruption which disturbs the flow of the sentence; cf. Micah vii. 16. The words "Thou wilt establish peace," in ver. 12, express the sure hope of a state of peace which will no longer be destroyed; and this hope is based on the fact that everything which the congregation has hitherto accomplished (מַעֲשֵׂה is the carrying out of work to which one is called, as in Ps. xc. 17; cf. the remarks on v. 12) has not been their own performance, but the work of Jehovah *for them.* In this way the liberation from the yoke of the imperial power, which they now desire, is also the work of Jehovah. The meaning of the complaint, "lords besides Thee had enslaved us," etc., is precisely the same as in lxiii. 19, with this difference, that the standpoint there is in the midst of the circum-

stances regarding which the complaint is made, while here it lies in the future beyond. Jehovah is the King of Israel. He seemed to have lost His dominion when the lords of the world ruled Israel as they liked; but it is otherwise now, and it is only Jehovah through whom (בְּךָ, "through Thee") Israel can again gratefully celebrate Jehovah's name.

The tyrants who usurped authority over Israel have disappeared without leaving a trace behind. Ver. 14: "*Dead men live not again; shades rise not again; therefore hast Thou visited and destroyed them, and annihilated every memorial to them.*" The meaning is not that they are dead for ever, as if there were no resurrection at all after death; the prophet knows certainly there is such a thing, as afterwards appears. When he speaks of מֵתִים and רְפָאִים, he has in his mind those who have hitherto been oppressors of Israel, who (like the king of Babylon, chap. xiv.) have been cast down into the realm of the shades, so that we are not to think of a self-resuscitation, a rising up again. The conjunction לָכֵן ("therefore," "then"), like the Greek *ἄρα*, introduces what has happened along with another event, and is bound up with the very fact of its occurrence (cf. similar cases in lxi. 7; Jer. v. 2, ii. 33; Zech. xi. 7; Job xxxiv. 25, xlii. 3); and the meaning of the passage is that they have fallen into Sheôl, from which they cannot be brought back (Ps. xlix. 15),—then God has utterly swept them away, so that not even their name is perpetuated. When Israel has cause to praise Jehovah in this way, it will again have become a numerous people. Ver. 15: "*Thou hast added to the nation, O Jehovah, Thou hast added to the nation; Thou hast glorified Thyself, Thou hast extended all the boundaries of the land.*" The verb יָסַף, elsewhere construed with עַל or אֶל, is here followed by לְ, and contains its object within itself, "to add to" being the same as to give increase. What is here stated is of parallel import with ix. 2 (cf. xlix. 19 f., liv. 1 f.; Micah ii. 12, iv. 7; Obad. 19 f., and many other passages; regarding רִחַקְתָּ, see especially Micah vii. 11); it is also contained, in germ, in vi. 13*b*.

The prayer now returns once more to the retrospect already taken, in vers. 8, 9, of the night of sorrow which preceded the redemption that had taken place. Vers. 16–18: "*O Jehovah, in distress they missed Thee; they poured out gentle prayers*

because Thy chastisement fell on them. As a woman with child, who is nearing her delivery, writhes, cries out in her pangs, so have we been before Thee, O Jehovah. We have been with child, we have writhed in pain; it was as if we brought forth wind: deliverance we have not wrought for the land, nor did inhabitants of the world come to the light." The circumstantial clause, בְּיוֹסְרָךְ לָמוֹ, "while Thy chastisement was afflicting them" (לָ being used as in ver. 9), corresponds to בַּצַּר in the parallel member; and to פָּקַד (here used in the sense of looking and longing for, as in xxxiv. 16; 1 Sam. xx. 6, xxv. 15; Jer. iii. 16) corresponds צָקוֹן לַחַשׁ, "they pour out complaint,"—the perfect (from צוּק = יָצַק, Job xxviii. 2, xxix. 6, to pour out, melt), with the plural termination ן (which elsewhere occurs only twice, viz. in Deut. viii. 3, 16, for יְקִיתֶן in xxix. 31 is the imperfect from קוּשׁ); and לַחַשׁ means "whispering," not here as in iii. 3, a whispered utterance of incantation-formulas (G. A. Smith: "they pour out incantations"), but a whispered prayer; for sorrow and consciousness of guilt form so depressing a burden that one cannot venture to speak aloud to God (cf. xxix. 4). Pregnancy and pangs here symbolize a state of most intense expectancy, the end of which seems to be so much the nearer the more the sufferings are intensified. The Church, looking back upon the past, says: "We often thought that deliverance would certainly break forth, but our hope was ever anew disappointed." The first כְּמוֹ is equivalent to כְּ ("like a woman with child who," etc.; see the remarks on viii. 23); the second כְּמוֹ is equivalent to כַּאֲשֶׁר (cf. Gen. xix. 15; Prov. xxiii. 7), "[it was] as if we brought forth wind," etc.; the mode of construction is not an inversion for "we brought forth, as it were, wind," but כְּמוֹ in the sense of "[it was] as if" governs the whole clause. The result of the painful labour was, like that of the seeming pregnancy, a wind-birth; but this state of matters also, as is declared by מִפָּנֶיךָ, was the effect of Jehovah's working; it was assuredly the consequence of the sins of Israel, and the nation's continued want of the proper capacity for receiving salvation. Along with disappointed hope, ver. 18 sets forth the fruitlessness of man's own work. Israel's own doings,—no, these availed not to "make the land salvation," *i.e.* to aid it in reaching full and satisfactory salvation; and (for so we may understand the clause at the end)

they waited in vain for the judgment of Jehovah upon the sinful world opposed to them,—or, they made vain efforts to conquer these nations. This explanation is favoured by the fact that the expression יֹשְׁבֵי חֵבֶל, throughout the entire cycle of prophecy, does not denote the inhabitants of the Holy Land, but those of the world, in the sense of κόσμος (see ver. 21, xxiv. 5, 6). The correlation between יִפְּלוּ and תַּפִּיל (ver. 19), however, as well as the preceding figure of the birth-pangs, preponderatingly declares for the view that נָפַל is meant to refer to the falling of the fruit of the body (cf. Wisd. vii. 3; *Iliad*, xix. 110, καταπεσεῖν and πεσεῖν, Talm. to miscarry, as in *Kerîthôth* ii. 4, and generally to throw off or separate in the manner of birth). And the expression יֹשְׁבֵי חֵבֶל suits this meaning (viz. that the expected increase of population did not take place), from the fact that it does not here signify "*the* inhabitants of the earth," but (indefinitely) "inhabitants of the earth," or, as we say, young, new-born "mortals." The condition of the country, as chastised through the oppression of the imperial power, still continued, and there was no appearance of a new generation to repeople the waste land (*Bibl. Psychology*, p. 485, Eng. trans.).

But this has now taken place; and instead of singing in ver. 19 of what has occurred, the prayer places itself in the midst of the occurrence: "*Thy dead ones shall live, my dead bodies shall rise again: awake and exult, ye who lie in the dust. For thy dew is the dew of lights, and the earth will bring shades to the light.*" Such is the language of the Church in the last days, after it has turned to God. Through long-continued sufferings and chastisements, it has melted away to a small remnant; and many of those who could truly be reckoned among its members are now lying dead in the dust of the grave. In the confidence of faith, and in full persuasion of a hope that shall not be put to shame, the cry is raised, "Thy dead ones (those who belong, O Lord, to Thee, and who therefore cannot be lost) shall live again" (*reviviscent*, as in תְּחִיַּת הַמֵּתִים, the reawakening of the dead); and comfort is drawn from the workings of God's power and grace which were at that very time being set in operation: "My dead bodies shall rise again" (נְבֵלָה being a word without plural form, but frequently used with plural meaning, as in

v. 25, and therefore here conjoined with יְקוּמָה = תְּקוּמֶנָּה; in the present form, before the light suffix, there is retention of the *ē*, which under other circumstances is lost); while the certainty of the divine purpose gives the ground for the powerful word of faith proclaimed over the field where lie the dead, "Awake, and shout for joy, ye that dwell in the dust," —this utterance of strong faith finding its justification of itself in looking up to Jehovah with the confession, "Thy dew is dew born out of (supernatural) lights, as the natural dew is born of the morning-dawn" (Ps. cx. 3). Instead of "dew upon herbs" (יֶרֶקוֹת = אוֹרוֹת, as in 2 Kings iv. 39) we take אוֹרוֹת (from אוֹרָה, as in Ps. cxxxix. 12), in the sense of אוֹר הַחַיִּים, "the light of life." The plural indicates that there is a perfect fulness of the lights of life in God ("the Father of lights," Jas. i. 17). Of these is born the gentle dew that revivifies the bones which have been sown in the earth (Ps. cxli. 7),—a deeply significant figure, which is quite obliterated by Hofmann, who would here read טַל חוֹרוֹת, "dew of thorough saturation." Luther, who renders "thy dew is a dew of the green field," stands alone among the earlier translators; the Targum, Syriac, Jerome, and Saadia all translate, "thy dew is the dew of light," and, considering the intimate connection in which the Scriptures everywhere place אוֹר, φῶς, and חַיִּים, ζωή, this is natural enough.

But we go on to translate, "and the earth (וְאֶרֶץ being the subject, as in Prov. xxv. 3; cf. lxv. 17, where it is the object; this form is used instead of וְאֶרֶץ, which, except in Job xx. 27 and 1 Kings xi. 18, is always only in the construct state) will bring shades to light" (הַפִּיל being the causative from נָפַל, ver. 18), *i.e.* bring forth again the dead who have sunk into it; this is the rendering of Luther in the edition of 1541, "and the land will cast forth the dead" (see *Biblical Psychology*, p. 485, Eng. trans.), and it was also preferred by A. H. Franke. The dew from the glory of God falls like a heavenly seed into the bosom of the earth; and in consequence of this the earth gives up the shades which it has hitherto held fast, so that they again appear alive on the surface of the earth. Those who understand ver. 18 as referring to the earnestly expected overthrow of the masters of the world, explain this expression, in conformity with that view, as

meaning "and to the earth (אֶרֶץ being taken as a local accusative = עַד־אֶרֶץ, ver. 5, or לָאָרֶץ in xxv. 12) dost thou cast down shades," or even, "and the earth causes shades to fall" (*i.e.* into itself). Such is the view of Rosenmüller, who says, "terra per prosopopoeiam, ut supra, xxiv. 20, inducta, deturbare in orcum sistitur impios, eo ipso manes eos reddens." But though, according to that view, רְפָאִים agrees with ver. 14, in which the oppressors of God's people received this designation, yet the rendering would be doubtful here, where the term would need to signify, "those who by that very fact are becoming shades;" but especially, if it be understood as referring to the fall of the oppressors, this succeeding clause gives no natural sequence and progress to the next words, "thy dew is the dew of lights," whereas, according to our explanation, it confines and seals the faith, hope, and prayer of the Church by what follows. Compared with what is stated in the Apocalypse of the New Testament, it is the "first resurrection" which is here predicted. Reuss remarks that the reference here is to national restitution, and not to the resurrection of individuals; this may be true of Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14, but the prophet here plainly means to say that those who acknowledge Jehovah will be awakened out of their graves and restored to the Church. The Church of the times of glory is a Church of those who have been miraculously saved and awakened, both in the present dispensation and in the life to come. Beneath the ground at their feet lie their persecutors.

Of the judgment upon these persecutors no mention is made till after the Church is made up through the addition of its members who had died, though that judgment, in order of actual occurrence, precedes. The standpoint of prophecy in these chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.) continually oscillates backwards and forwards, and this fact explains the exhortation and the attendant reason assigned in vers. 20, 21: "*Go, my people; enter into thy chambers, and shut thy door behind thee: hide thyself for a little moment, until the judgment of wrath passes by. For, behold, Jehovah goeth forth from His place, to visit the iniquity of the inhabitants of the earth upon them, and the earth reveals the blood she had drunk in, and no more covers her dead.*" The song (שִׁיר) has now come to an end,

and the prophet as such speaks once more. While the judgment of wrath (זַעַם) goes on till it shall have passed away (on the future perfect, cf. x. 12, iv. 4; and on the thing itself, see אַחֲרִית הַזַּעַם, Dan. viii. 19), the people of God are to continue in the solitude of prayer (Matt. vi. 6; cf. Ps. xxvii. 5, xxxi. 21).. This they can do, for the judgment by which they are delivered from their foes is the work of Jehovah alone; and this they are to do, for only those who are hidden by God in prayer escape the wrath. The judgment lasts but כִּמְעַט־רֶגַע (x. 24, 25, liv. 7, 8; cf. Ps. xxx. 6), "a little moment," a short time, shortened for the sake of the elect. Instead of the dual-form דְּלָתַיִךְ (as the house-door, but not the chamber-door is called), the word has with greater show of reason been pointed דַּלְתֵךְ (from דֶּלֶת = דָּלָה); in like manner חֲבֵה is perhaps purposely changed into the feminine form חֲבִי, because Jehovah acts for the people, while they in a purely passive manner commit themselves to His keeping. Just as Noah, behind whom Jehovah shut the door of the ark, was hidden in it while the torrents of water poured down in judgment outside, — so is the Church to shut itself off from the world without, in its life of prayer, because a storm of judgment is impending. "He goes forth from His place" (the words being exactly the same as in Micah i. 3), *i.e.* not out of His own immanent divine life, but out of the sphere of manifested glory in which He has shown Himself as present to the spirits. Thence He goes forth, prepared for executing judgment, to visit the inhabitant (יֹשֵׁב is to be regarded as a collective) of the earth for his misdeeds, especially his blood-guiltiness. The prohibition of murder dates from the times of Noah, hence it was inserted as one of the conditions in the "everlasting covenant" (xxiv. 5). The earth brings forward two witnesses: (1) The innocent blood, violently shed (on דָּמִים see i. 15), which she was forced to drink in, but which, now disclosed, cries aloud for vengeance; (2) the persons themselves who have been innocently murdered (cf. חֲרוּגִים, Ezek. xxxvii. 9), and who slumber within her. Streams of blood come to light and bear witness; martyrs arise and testify against their murderers. The earth is appeased through vengeance being taken for the martyr-blood it has drunk (Deut. xxxii. 43; cf. Num. xxxv. 33).

In xxvii. 1 the special objects of Jehovah's judgment are indicated in figurative but enigmatical language: "*On that day will Jehovah visit with His sword—the heavy, large, and strong one—leviathan the fleet serpent, and leviathan the tortuous serpent, and He will slay the dragon which is in the sea.*" The three animals are doubtless symbols of three empires. There is no truth in the assertion (by Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Knobel, Umbreit, and Luzzatto), that there are no more three animals than there are three swords. If the preposition with the suffixed noun "his sword" were repeated before each adjective (בְּחַרְבּוֹ הַקָּשָׁה וּבְחַרְבּוֹ הַגְּדוֹלָה וגו׳) we should have to understand that there were also three swords; but it is in this threefold manner (with עַל repeated) that the statement is made regarding the number of the animals. We have thus to ask what are the three empires. Now, the תַּנִּין (the long aquatic animal) is the constant emblem of Egypt (li. 9; Ps. lxxiv. 13; Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2). And as the country of the Euphrates and Assyria are mentioned in vers. 12, 13 along with Egypt, it is highly probable that the two other animals will mean the kingdom on the Tigris (*i.e.* Assyria, with its capital Nineveh, on the Tigris), and the kingdom on the Euphrates (*i.e.* Chaldea, with its capital Babylon, on the Euphrates). Besides, the designation of the two kingdoms by means of the common term "leviathan," while the difference is indicated merely by the attributive in each case, certainly points to two related kingdoms. We must not allow ourselves to be misled by the fact that נָחָשׁ בָּרִחַ in Job xxvi. 13 indicates a constellation; here we have not בַּמָּרוֹם as in xxiv. 21, and we are therefore on the surface of the earth. The primary occasion of the designation here given was the situation of the two cities. Nineveh stood on the Tigris, the Hebraized name of which (viz. חִדֶּקֶל) points to its rapid course and terrible rapids; hence Assyria is compared to a serpent moving in a rapid, impetuous, and long-extended course (בָּרִחַ as in xliii. 14, for בְּרִיחַ, following the form עֵלִיז, — different from בְּרִיחַ, a bar or bolt, xv. 5); Babylon, on the other hand, is compared to a winding serpent, *i.e.* one that moves in serpentine curves, because it was situated on the Euphrates, which has many turns and labyrinth-like windings, especially in the vicinity of Babylon.

For the river, which formerly used to flow straight on, was made to wind about through curves artificially formed, in such a way that it had thrice to pass the same place (called Arderikka), which, in the time of Herodotus, as he assures us, every one who sailed down the river could not avoid passing three times in three days.[1] The peculiar feature of the tortuous serpent symbolizes, it would seem, both the longer duration of the one empire than the other, and the more numerous complications in which it will involve Israel. The empire on the Tigris soon pounces upon Israel, so that the fate of this kingdom is quickly decided; whereas the empire on the Euphrates advances by many windings, and surrounds its prey with many folds. These windings are all the more numerous because, in the view of the prophet, Babylon is the final form in which the empire of the world appears; hence Israel continues to be entwined by this serpent till the last days. The judgment on Assyria, Babylon, and Egypt is the judgment on all the world-empires together.

D.—*The fourth echo: the fruitful vineyard under the protection of Jehovah,* chap. xxvii. 2–6.

The prophecy now, in vers. 2–5, for the fourth time passes into the form and spirit of a song. In the judgments on the world, the Church recognises itself as Jehovah's carefully protected and beloved vineyard.

"On that day,—
A merry vineyard,—sing of it!
I, Jehovah, its keeper,—
Every moment I water it.
That nothing may visit it,
Day and night I keep it.

[1] In Greek, several rivers are called Δράκων or Ὄφις; moreover Φίδαοι, the modern Greek name of the Euênos, is equivalent to Ὀφιδάριον. Cf. Paul Cassel's *Drachenkämpfe* (1868), p. 106. The Books of the Augurs called the river Tiber *colubrum tanquam flexuosum* (Serv. on *Aen.* viii. 95). Moreover, both Aratus (*Phaen.* 45) and Virgil (*Georg.* i. 244) compare the constellation known by the name of the Dragon to a stream winding its way, *flexu sinuoso*, between the two Bears.

Wrath have I none—
O, had I thorns, thistles before me!
In battle would I break forth on them,
Burn them all together.
Men would then need to lay hold of my protection—
Make peace with me,
Peace make with me."

Instead of introducing the song, as in xxvi. 1, with "this song shall be sung," or "they shall say," or similar words, the prophecy at once makes a transition into the song: the case is the same as in Ps. lxxxvii. 7. It forms a descending scale of strophes,—one of five lines (vers. 2, 3), one of four lines (ver. 4), and one of three lines (ver. 5). The theme or subject stands at the beginning, in the absolute case: כֶּרֶם חֶמֶד may mean a vineyard (cf. כֶּרֶם זַיִת in Judg. xv. 5), and this, too (for the term خمر, which in Arabic means "wine" —from its fermenting—is a choice poetic word in Hebrew), one which produces fiery, generous wine; perhaps, however, the reading should be כֶּרֶם חֶמֶד, as indicated in xxxii. 12, the LXX., Targum, and some MSS. The expression עָנָה לְ (as in Ex. xxxii. 18, and more frequently the Qal, Num. xxi. 17; Hos. ii. 17; cf. our remarks on Ps. cxlvii. 7) signifies to strike up or begin a song regarding anything: it is a different word from עָנָה (عنى, cognate with حنّ, to "meet," *ἀμείβεσθαι*), to make a nasal sound, then to sing through the nose (*i.e.* in Oriental fashion). The term כֶּרֶם, "vineyard," is feminine here, like בְּאֵר in the song of the well, Num. xxi. 17 f., and like Israel, which is symbolized by the vineyard (iii. 14, v. 1 f.), and is sometimes regarded as a masculine, sometimes as a feminine (xxvi. 20). Jehovah Himself is introduced as speaking. He is the keeper of this vineyard, who waters it every moment when there is need (the plural form לְרָגָעִים being used distributively, instead of the doubled singular,—like לַבְּקָרִים, "every morning," in xxxiii. 2), and watches it by night as well as by day, so that nothing may "visit it,"—the expression פָּקַד עַל, which is elsewhere used to signify visitation by punishment, being here used of visitation through mis-

fortune of any kind.[1] Because it is the Church which has been purified through misfortunes, the feeling of Jehovah towards it is one of pure love, without any admixture of burning wrath (חֵמָה)—a disposition which is displayed only towards those who venture to injure this vineyard. It is by way of challenge that Jehovah says, "Who, then, gives me thorns, thistles!" The form יִתְּנֵנִי is used instead of יִתֵּן לִי, as in Jer. ix. 1; cf. Josh. xv. 19. The unconnected "thorns, thistles" instead of "thorns and thistles," which is the form usually employed elsewhere, is quite in keeping with the impassioned state of the great protector. If He had thorns, thistles before Him, He would burst forth upon them (בָּהּ being used in a neuter sense,—upon such a mass of bushes) in war, and set them on fire (הַצִּית = הֲצִית). The arrangement of the strophes requires us, with Knobel, against the accents, to connect בַּמִּלְחָמָה with אֶפְשָׁעָה; the vocalisation of this word (instead of which there is also found the reading אֶפְשָׁעָה) is to be decided in the same way as that of סְבָבְלוֹ in ix. 3, and לֶקְחָה in Gen. ii. 23, בַּמְּעָרָה in 2 Kings ii. 1, 11, etc. In the very choice of the expression בַּמִּלְחָמָה, we may plainly see that thorns and thistles represent the enemies of the Church (2 Sam. xxiii. 6 f.). In this sense the brief song concludes with ver. 5: only by giving themselves up to mercy will they find mercy. When אוֹ is followed by the voluntative, it signifies "unless," as in Lev. xxvi. 41; הֶחֱזִיק בְּ (as in 1 Kings i. 50, where it is applied to Adonijah, who seized the horns of the altar) is here combined with מָעוֹז, in which are intertwined the meanings of a "strong rock" (from עָזַז) and a "place of refuge" (from עוּז, to hide oneself, flee for refuge; cf. the remarks on xxx. 2); עָשָׂה שָׁלוֹם לְ is employed as in Josh. ix. 15. Here ends the song. What the Church expresses in it is her consciousness of the gracious protection of her God, —a conviction that has been confirmed by her most recent experiences.

To the song of the vineyard the prophet adds, as if by way

[1] The rabbis of Tiberias (Menahem ben Seruk, etc.) read אֶבְקֹר instead of the form in the text; and the older expositors (followed by Abarbanel) explain the passage as if it read פֶּן יִבָּקֵר עָלֶה, "that its foliage may not be found wanting:" see Ewald-Dukes, *Beiträge*, ii. 146.

of explanation, in ver. 6: "*In the future will Jacob strike roots, Israel will blossom and bud, and fill the surface of the earth with fruits.*" That the peculiar language of prophecy recommences here is seen even in the use of הַבָּאִים (a temporal accusative, as in Eccles. ii. 16, which in meaning is equivalent to הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים וְ, "behold, days are coming when . . ." Jer. vii. 32, etc.). On the employment of the active form וּמָלְאוּ, cf. Jer. xix. 4, Ezek. viii. 17, etc. The divergent reading תְּבוּנָה has arisen from an error of the scribes. Some editors have יִפְרַח as the *Kethîb*, and וּפָרַח as the *Qerî*. The prophet says, in figurative language (cf. xxxvii. 31), the same as what the apostle declares in Rom. xi. 12, that Israel, when restored to favour as a nation, will become "the riches of the Gentiles."

Jehovah's dealings with Israel for their Chastisement and for their Salvation, Chap. XXVII. 7–13.

The prophet does not now, even in ver. 7 ff., return to his own actual present, but, certain that Israel will not be exalted before it has been thoroughly humbled on account of its sins, he places himself in the midst of this condition of punishment. And then, in full view of the glorious future of Israel, there comes out clearly before his eyes the fact that the punitive dealings of God towards Israel are quite different from those directed against the world. Vers. 7, 8: "*Hath He smitten it like the smiting of its smiter, or hath it been stricken down, like the striking of those stricken by it? In measure, when thou didst drive it away, didst thou punish it, sifting with strong blast on the day of the east wind.*" מַכֵּהוּ, "its smiter," is the empire that attacked Israel (x. 20), and הֲרֻגָיו are the slain ones of the empire who have fallen under the strokes of Jehovah. The former smites unmercifully, and its slain ones are lying without hope (xxvi. 14); Jehovah smites differently, and it is different with the Church which was slain in the persons of many of its righteous members. (On the two cases of play upon words, cf. xxiv. 16, xxii. 18, x. 16.) When Jehovah rejected Israel (as if by means of a "bill of divorcement," l. 1), He contended against it (xlix. 25), *i.e.* punished it "in measure" (בְּסַאסְאָה סְאָה = בְּסַאסְּפָהּ), and only in measure (cf.

"peace, peace," xxvi. 3), not in unmeasured wrath, but in a manner conditioned by the terms of the covenant (cf. בְּמִשְׁפָּט, Jer. x. 24; לְמִשְׁפָּט) xxx. 11, xlvi. 28). Hitzig, Ewald, and Knobel read בְּסַאסְאָהּ (from a form סָאסָא, allied to זָעַע and also טָאטָא, "when thou didst disturb it," or, "didst drive it away"); but the traditional text does not point to any various reading showing ה with *mappiq* (הּ); and the early translations (except the LXX., which has *μαχόμενος*) and expositors all regard the word as a reduplication of סְאָה, which, as the third part of an ephah, here indicates a pretty large measure. The clause הָנָה בְּרוּחוֹ is possibly to be regarded as an elliptical relative clause, in which case also the transition into the third person is best explained ("thou who sifted," etc.); but perhaps הָגֹה has been intended. הָנָה here (as in Prov. xxiv. 4 f.; see our remarks on that passage) means to separate, remove (*e.g.* the dross from silver, i. 25). Jehovah sifted Israel (cf. the figure of the threshing-floor in xxi. 10) when, appointing the captivity for the nation, He blew upon it as violently as if the east wind were raging (see our commentary on Job xxvii. 21).

But He merely sifted, He did not destroy; He was angry, but not without love; He punished, but this in order that He might pardon again. Ver. 9: "*Therefore, in this way will the iniquity of Jacob be atoned for; and this is all the fruit of the removal of his sin: when he makes all altar-stones like lime-stones that have been broken to pieces, images of Astarte and sun-pillars do not rise up again.*" With the word "therefore," a conclusion is drawn from the previous expression "in measure:" God punishes Israel moderately; His punishment is a remedial measure, hence it gives way as soon as its end is attained, and it will be removed even now if Israel completely renounces sin, and, especially, the sin of all sins—idolatry. בְּזֹאת ("thus," or "in this way") points to the following בְּיָשׂוּמוֹ ("when he makes"),—by this, namely, the destruction of the altars and the images of Ishtar (Ashēra), and of the sun-god (see the remarks on xvii. 8). By Israel's putting away the fundamental cause of all evil, namely, idolatry (which still continued to flourish among the exiles, Ezek. xi. 18, etc.), the guilt for which it has now to suffer will be covered, *i.e.* will be esteemed by God as no longer existent (see the remarks on

xxii. 14).[1] The intermediate clause (cf. xxvi. 11*b*) declares that this which follows will be the very fruit, sought by Jehovah, of the removal of Israel's sin, which He designed to accomplish through chastisement.

The prophet says this, speaking out from the midst of the state of punishment; and he can thus now further prove, by the punishment which has followed the sin, that the punishment will cease with the sin. Vers. 10, 11: "*For the fenced city is solitary, a dwelling given up and forsaken like the wilderness; there calves feed, and there they lie down and devour its branches. When its twigs become dry, they are broken off; women come, make fires of them, for it is not an intelligent nation; therefore its Creator pities it not, and its Former shows it no favour.*" These chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.) everywhere present such a mixture of light and darkness that it is a question whether by עִיר בְּצוּרָה is meant the capital of the world-empire or the capital of the people of God; our opinion is that only Jerusalem can be meant, inasmuch as Israel certainly is the people with no discernment (i. 3), the nation of which Jehovah is called the Creator and Former (xxii. 11). The standpoint of the prophet is therefore on the other side of the destruction of Jerusalem, in the midst of the exile. In spite of this, everything has an Isaian ring; cf. generally xxxii. 13 f., v. 17, and in particular xvi. 2, 9, xi. 7, etc. The suffix in the expression "its branches" refers to the city, whose ruins were overgrown with bushes. Synonymous with סְעִפִּים, "branches" (always with *Dagesh*, to distinguish it from סְעִיפִים, "clefts," ii. 21), is קָצִיר, a "cutting," or sprig that can easily be cut off; this word has been erroneously rendered "harvest" in the Vulgate, as well as by Symmachus and Saadias. The form תִּשָּׁבַרְנָה is not a singular (as in xxviii. 3), but a plural (Ges. § 47, note 3), referring to the separate twigs of which קָצִיר the brushwood (*i.e.* dried branches) consists; reference is made to this, in a neuter sense, by אוֹתָהּ; "women light it" (תָּאִיר, as in Mal. i. 10), *i.e.* make with it a flame giving light (אוֹר), and warm-

[1] The condition presupposes the prevalence of idolatry at the time among the people; hence Smend, who brings down the date of chaps. 24–27 to the fourth century B.C., understands advance of the Jews towards the heathen worship around them.

ing fire (אוּר, xliv. 16). So waste will Jerusalem lie that in places where men once swarmed, a calf will comfortably be eating off the green foliage of the bushes growing between the ruins; and where hostile armies had been forced to withdraw without having accomplished their object, women come and take away, undisturbed, as much wood as they require.

But when Israel repents, the grace of God will change everything. Vers. 12, 13: "*And it will come to pass on that day, a beating will Jehovah make from the swelling of the Euphrates to the brook of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one to another, ye sons of Israel. And it will come to pass on that day, there shall be a blowing with a great trumpet, and those who are lost in the land of Assyria come, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and cast themselves down before Jehovah, in the holy mountain in Jerusalem.*" All those expositions of ver. 12 which understand it as referring, like ver. 13, to the return of the exiles, I regard as false. The Euphrates and the brook of Egypt (*i.e.* the *Wady el-'Arish*) are, of course, the promised boundaries of the land of Israel on the north-east and south-west (Gen. xv. 18; 1 Kings viii. 65); and it is not stated that Jehovah will beat on the outside of these boundaries, but within them. Hence Gesenius seems to be pretty correct when he says that "the kingdom will be re-peopled to the fullest extent that had been promised, and that, too, as rapidly and as numerously as if human beings were dropping like olives from the trees." The term חָבַט is certainly applied in Deut. xxiv. 20 to the beating of olives; but this figure does not suit the present passage, for olives, before they can be beaten down from the trees, must already be in existence, whereas the land of Israel is to be regarded as desolate. What we expect is that Jehovah (as promised in xxvi. 19, 21) will make the dead to live within the whole wide extent of the promised land. חָבַט (cf. خبط, to beat something off, *e.g.* to beat a tree in order to shake off leaves or fruit) is the word usually employed to indicate the beating out of those husked fruits which are too tender and valuable to be threshed; these are carefully beaten with a stick, as mentioned in xxviii. 27, for they would be destroyed by violent process of threshing. The large and extensive field

of the dead, stretching from the Euphrates to the Rhinokoloura, is compared to a threshing-floor covered with such fine and tender fruit. There lie true Israelites and apostate Israelites mingled together; but Jehovah will separate the one company from the other. He will set a beating in operation that the true members of the Church may appear, separated from the false, as the grains are separated from the husks and the straw. "Thy dead ones shall live,"—to this the prophet here returns. And with this view accords the choice of the word שִׁבֹּלֶת, which combines in itself the meanings of "streaming" (Ps. lxix. 3, 16), and an "ear" of corn, שָׁבַל (to go, move on), being equally applicable to the waters which flow along and to the elongated head of the stalk of corn grown up (cf. also שִׁבֳּל in xlvii. 2). In this passage the word, admitting of two meanings, presents a beautiful dilogy (cf. a similar case in xix. 18 and Hab. ii. 7). From the "ear" of the Euphrates to the Peninsula of Sinai, Jehovah will beat—a great heap of ears, the grains of which are to be gathered together into one לְאַחַד אֶחָד (a construct form, without the genitival relation, as is frequently the case with this numeral, *e.g.* in 2 Sam. xvii. 22), one, *i.e.* one to the other, hence not in a slump, wholesale, but with careful attention given to every individual (cf. אַחַת לְאַחַת, Eccles. vii. 27). To this risen Church there comes the still living scattered ones, gathered by divine signal (cf. xviii. 3, xi. 12). Assyria and Egypt are specifically named as lands in which the banished ones are found, but these countries represent all the lands of exile, as in xix. 23–25, cf. xi. 11. Both names are emblematical, and hence are not to be used as a proof that the prophecy lay within the horizon of Isaiah.

END OF VOL. I.

DATE DUE

JUN 15 1987

JUN 15 1991

8-31-92

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS1515 .D354 1894 v.1
Biblical commentary on the prophecies of
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00059 9284